A

LETTER

TO

Mr *DODWELL*;

Wherein all the Arguments in his *Epiſtolary Diſcourſe* againſt the Immortality of the SOUL are particularly anſwered, and the Judgment of *the Fathers* concerning that Matter truly repreſented.

By *Samuel Clarke*, M. A. Chaplain to the Right Reverend Father in God *JOHN*, Lord Biſhop of *Norwich*.

LONDON,

Printed by *W. Botham*; for *James Knapton*, at the *Crown* in St *Paul's* Church-Yard. 1706.

ERRATUM.

Pag. 93. *Line penult.* read, *Eruditionis.*

A LETTER TO Mr *DODWELL*, &c.

SIR,

IT is a thing of very ill conſequence, when Men of great reputation in the World for Learning, in their Diſcourſes upon the moſt important Doctrines of Religion, raſhly and upon very little grounds, allow themſelves to advance new and crude Notions, and extravagant Hypotheſes; which the Profane *will* not, and the Weak are not *able* to ſeparate, from the principal and fundamental and moſt neceſſary Doctrines themſelves.

For, as in Natural Philoſophy and in the ſearch after Phyſical Truth, the

Syſtems and Hypotheſes which ingenious Men invent for explaining the appearances of Nature, and which for ſome time are received with applauſe, but afterwards are confuted by Reaſon and Experience; are apt to make Men think the natural cauſes of things abſolutely impoſſible to be diſcovered at all; and have really ſuch an effect upon very Many, as to make them reject for their ſake, or at leaſt to call in queſtion, even the certaineſt Truths which have been diſcovered by plain Experiments or clear Mathematical demonſtration it ſelf: So in matters of Religion likewiſe, the inconſiderate and groundleſs Notions, which Men of great Learning and much Reading, have with too little Judgment ſometimes joyned and intermixed with their explications of ſome of the greateſt and moſt important Doctrines of Religion; when upon due Examination, the abſurdity and inconſiſtency of ſuch Schemes plainly appears; have been apt to raiſe doubts in many Mens Minds concerning the Truth even of the certaineſt Doctrines themſelves, which are either the moſt plainly diſcovered by right Reaſon, or are

moſt

moſt clearly delivered in Scripture.

You teach that the *Soul of Man* is *naturally mortal*, and will of it ſelf periſh and come to nothing, if not upheld by the extraordinary Power of God, in a præternatural way. Many, who ſee the imprudent Title of your Diſcourſe, and will not take the pains to read the Book it ſelf, will conclude that you ſuppoſe the Soul to periſh at the diſſolution of the Body; And all Libertines, when they *have* read and conſidered all that you offer, will ſtill conclude, that if (as you grant to them) the Soul muſt of it ſelf naturally periſh ſometime or other, there is no time ſo probable when it ſhould periſh, as at the diſſolution of the Body; and they will eaſily perſwade themſelves to rely upon this, that God will not work a perpetual Miracle to preſerve them preternaturally by his omnipotent Power, on purpoſe to inflict upon them an eternal Puniſhment, which by nature they were not capable of undergoing.

Theſe Mens concluſion indeed is by no means right; But it is ſuch a one, as is very natural for Men of looſe Principles and vitious Lives to draw

from your Doctrine; And therefore you ought to have been very careful not to give them ſuch an occaſion of deceiving themſelves, unleſs you had firſt been very ſure that your Notion was either very plainly contained in Scripture, or very clearly demonſtrable by right Reaſon: Which that it is not, I preſume will appear from the following Obſervations.

You begin with a diſtinction (*Præmon. Sect.* 3.) that the Souls of ſome Men are made immortal by the *Spirit* of God, to Happineſs; and the Souls of ſome others, by the *Will* of God, to Puniſhment. Now what can be more precarious and groundleſs than this diſtinction? For what real difference is there in the thing it ſelf, between being immortalized by the *Spirit*, and by the *Will* of God? Eternal *Life and Happineſs* is indeed conſtantly attributed to the *Spirit of God*; that is, thoſe only who have the *Spirit of God*, and are *guided by it*, who obey the Will of God, and live in conformity to his holy Laws, ſhall be partakers of *Eternal Happineſs*: And thus the *Spirit of God* is indeed neceſſary to qualify Men

Men for, and to make them capable of, the *Happineſs of Heaven*. But if, to make good Men capable of an *Eternal Duration* in order to that Happineſs, it be neceſſary that the *Spirit of God* give them a new *Principle of Subſiſtence*, or ſuperadd a *new Subſtance to their Souls*; (as your obſcure Expreſſions concerning *the Acceſſion of an adſcititious Spirit*, &c, frequently ſeem to ſignify; and without which, there is no other difference than only in Words, between being immortalized by the *Spirit* and by the *Will* of God;) then nothing can be more contrary to reaſon, than to ſuppoſe any Men made immortal without the addition of that new Principle; nor can any repreſentation of Gods proceedings, be more harſh and incredible, than to ſuppoſe him by his Omnipotent *Will* and Power, eternally and miraculouſly preſerving ſuch Creatures unto endleſs Puniſhment, who never had in them, either *originally* or *additionally*, any *Principle of* Immortality at all. How *plainly* and how *very much* more agreeable to Reaſon and to our natural Notions of God is it, to ſay that all Creatures who ſhall ever undergo e-

ternal Puniſhment, are ſuch as having been created *naturally* immortal, and by wilful continuance in Sin having ſo far depraved themſelves as to become uncapable of eternal Happineſs, muſt conſequently by the juſt judgment of God fall into ſuch Miſery, as their immortal nature ſo corrupted neceſſarily makes them liable to. When we ſpeak of the Soul as created *naturally* immortal, we mean that it is by the *Divine Pleaſure* created ſuch a ſubſtance, as not having in itſelf any Compoſition, or any Principles of Corruption, will *naturally* or *of itſelf* continue for ever; that is, will not by any natural decay, or by any Power of Nature, be diſſolved or deſtroyed; But yet nevertheleſs depends continually upon God, who has Power to deſtroy or annihilate it, if he ſhould ſo think fit. When therefore you ſay that the *Original of the Immortality of ſuch Souls as ſhall be eternally puniſhed, may be more agreeably derived from the Divine Pleaſure, than from the Nature of the Soul*; if thereby you mean that the Soul was made immortal by the *mere pleaſure* of God, in oppoſition to its being immortal by the *neceſſity of*

its

its own Nature, in the ſenſe that God is immortal; then indeed not *Plato* only, but all others alſo that ever held the Immortality of the Soul, have been and are of the ſame Opinion: But if by thoſe Words you mean, as through the whole of your Diſcourſe you expreſſly declare, that the Soul was created mortal, but by the Divine Omnipotence is upheld eternally; then it is, on the contrary, evidently far more agreeable to right Reaſon and to our Notions of God, to derive the Immortality of the Soul, and eſpecially of a miſerable one, from its *own Nature*, than from the *Divine Pleaſure*; that is, to ſuppoſe the Soul to have been at firſt created ſuch a Subſtance, as by the ordinary concourſe of Divine Providence would continue for ever; than that it was created of a mortal and periſhable Nature, but by the extraordinary and miraculous Power of God, is continually ſupported, only to endure Torment and Puniſhment, beyond the capacity of its own Nature, to all Eternity.

There cannot eaſily be made a worſe repreſentation of Gods dealings with Mankind, than what you affirm (*Præ-*

mon. Sect. 4,) that *if the Devils had not fallen, there had been no Hell at all*; and that *Mankind is no otherwiſe concerned in it, than as, by joyning themſelves to the Devils party, they intitle themſelves* alſo *to his Puniſhment*. 'Tis true, the fire of Hell was *firſt and originally* prepared for the Devils, becauſe they were the *firſt and original* Offenders. But to ſay that, without their Fall, there *never* would have been *any* Hell *at all*; and that the ſame or equal Puniſhment ſhould not then have been inflicted upon Wicked Men for the ſame Crimes, as there now ſhall; is repreſenting God like an Arbitrary Tyrant, who without caring to make an exact, equal, and particular diſtribution of Juſtice, deals with all Offenders of all ranks and degrees alike, becauſe they have all *interpretatively* joyned in oppoſing his Authority.

You affirm expreſly (*ibid.*) that the Soul does *not depend on our groſs Organical Bodies, nor periſhes upon its diſſolution from thoſe Bodies.* I beſeech you, if the Soul be ſuch a ſubſtance as is incapable of being hurt by ſo great a change

change and diſſolution, as is cauſed in us by a violent Death, ſuppoſe by Fire; upon what Principle can it be imagined to be naturally mortal? or what Revolutions in Nature will it not be able to reſiſt and ſupervive? You explain this further, by ſaying, that Mens *Souls do not ſo depend on any other created Being, but that they may ſtill continue in their duration, whatſoever other created Influences be with-drawn from them, if God be pleaſed ſtill to continue that ordinary Providence, which is eſſentially neceſſary for their continuance.* And is not this the *very definition* of *Immortality?* or did ever any Man mean more than this, when he affirmed the Soul to be *naturally Immortal?* You diſtinguiſh it indeed from the Natural *Immortality of Angels*; but by ſuch a *diſtinction*, as includes not in it any the leaſt *difference.* For what difference is there between affirming concerning *Angels*, that *it is in the Power and Pleaſure of God, to annihilate them when he thinks fit*; and concerning *Humane Souls*, that *they do not ſo depend on any other created Beings, but that they may ſtill continue in their Duration, whatſoever other created Influences be withdrawn from them,*

if

if God be pleaſed ſtill to continue that ordinary Providence, which is eſſentially neceſſary for their Preſervation? And yet in the very next Words, you very inconſiſtently imagine the Soul, as being a mere *Flatus*, to have a *more immediate Dependance on God than other Creatures*, than even the meaneſt Particles of lifeleſs Matter have; *which muſt make it ceaſe to be, whenever he is pleaſed to ceaſe to breath it; as being unable to continue its Duration, by the Powers given it at its firſt Production, and the continuance of thoſe general Influences which are requiſite for the ſupport of created Beings in general.* According to theſe laſt Words, the Soul being not ſo much as a Subſtance of any kind at all, is likely to be more effectually deſtroyed by Death, than even the Body it ſelf. Whereas according to the Words juſt preceding, your Scheme ought to have been on the contrary, that the Soul is *by Nature Immortal*, and muſt be *mortalized* by the Omnipotence of God, if ever it periſh; and not, that it is *by Nature Mortal*, and muſt be *immortalized* by a new act of Omnipotence, to inable it to ſubſiſt for ever. So that here, you

ſeem

ſeem to have framed no conſiſtent Notion even of your own Scheme.

What you advance (*Præmon. Sect.* 5,) concerning its not having been culpable to hold communication and joyn with the Devil, before the Publication of the Goſpel; and that the Devil was not to be looked upon as a publick Enemy, before his being declared ſo by the Goſpel; is ſo extravagant, that it needs no Confutation. Was not the Devil an Enemy, when he tempted our firſt Parent? And was he not publickly declared to be ſo, in the Curſe pronounced to him thereupon? Is not the Devil deſcribed as a publick Enemy to God and good Men, in the Hiſtory of *Job*? And as an Eneny to *Iſrael*, 1 *Chron.* 21, 1? Or was he known to be an Enemy in *Temporal* Affairs only, (*Præmon. pag.* 41,) and could not be known to be ſo in things relating to the Life to come? Or had the Patriarchs no expectation at all of a *better City* to come, after the preſent *Tabernacle* was diſſolved? Is not *Idolatry* in the Old Teſtament conſtantly branded with as ſevere a character of *Rebellion* againſt God, as in

in the New? And in the Heathen World, before the Goſpel was begun to be preached, (though *the times of that Ignorance God* did indeed *wink at*, that is, would not be ſo ſevere in puniſhing them, as thoſe who ſhould afterwards ſin againſt greater Light;) yet was it no Crime, to *worſhip the Creature more than the Creator?* Was it no Fault that the World did κεῖσθαι ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ, lie under entire ſubjection to the *Evil One*, 1 Joh. 5, 19? and in the *Power of Satan*, Acts 26, 18? Were not the abominable Rites of the Heathen, plainly a ſacrificing to Devils? And do not all the Antient Fathers, for whoſe judgment you expreſs ſo great an eſteem, ſuppoſe in all their Writings againſt the Pagans, that before the propoſing of the Goſpel to them, they ought to have known from the Light of Nature and Right Reaſon, that thoſe impure Spirits whoſe worſhip was attended with all manner of beſtiality and wickedneſs, were profeſſed Enemies to God and Goodneſs? Nay, does not *St Paul* himſelf expreſly affirm, that *That which may be known of God*, was *manifeſt* enough to them, to have preſerved them from Idolatry?

Idolatry? and that, becauſe *they did not like to retain God in their knowledge*, but *changed the Truth of God into a Lie*, for that Reaſon *God gave them up unto vile affections*, &c.

Nor is it leſs abſurd, to found (as you do in the ſame place) the Heinouſneſs of Sin and the Reaſonableneſs of the Severity of its Puniſhment, principally upon its being *interpreted* as a joyning with the Devil. Idolatry indeed, and Witchcraft, and Profane Scoffing at God and all Religion, may juſtly enough come directly under this charge; and all other Sins alſo may in effect and in event, not improperly be looked upon as a promoting the Intereſt of the Devil, and an oppoſing the eſtabliſhment of the Kingdom of God: But to make the *formal Reaſon*, the heinouſneſs and demerit, not only of Idolatry, Witchcraft, and Profane open Oppoſition of Religion, but alſo of all other Sins whatſoever, to conſiſt not ſo much in the original depravity of the Actions themſelves, in their contrariety to Right Reaſon and to the Light of Nature and Conſcience, in their oppoſition to the Nature and Will and Law and Authority of God, as in their

their being *interpretatively* a joyning and communication with the Devil; To ſuppoſe God inflicting upon Men ſuch a Puniſhment, not as their Sins deſerve in their own Nature, and ſuch as the Nature of their own Souls makes them capable of falling into by wilful and obſtinate corruption and depravation of themſelves, but ſuch as * is *diſproportionable to their Nature*, and † *exceeding the natural Powers of their degree of Being*; and to account for this, only by ſaying, that Chriſt *will* ſo *interpret* their not joyning with Him, as if they had joyned themſelves to the Devil; Is not all this, to make God, in the hardeſt Senſe, act * *arbitrarily?*

* *Præmon.* p. 30.

† *ibid.* p. 28.

* *Præmon.* pag. 27.

Your Interpretation of *Ro.* 2, 12. and of *Joh.* 3, 19. (*Præm. Sect.* 6.) is ſo looſe and groundleſs, that *any Text* may in the ſame manner be brought to prove *any thing*, or rather *no Text* can really prove *any thing* at all. For if when St *Paul* ſays, *Rom.* 2, 12. *that as many as have ſinned without Law, ſhall alſo periſh without Law; and as many as have ſinned in the Law, ſhall be judged by the Law*; the Word *periſh* be not evidently Synonymous

nymous to being *judged* or *condemned*, and ſignifies that every Sinners condemnation or puniſhment ſhall be proportionable to the heinouſneſs of his Sin with reſpect to the Light he ſinned againſt; but on the contrary from the Word [ἀπολῦνται] *ſhall periſh*, it can be concluded that the Perſons ſpoken of ſhall only barely ceaſe to be, in oppoſition to the Word [κριθήσονται] *ſhall be judged or condemned*; It will follow equally from the uſe of the ſame Word in other places of Scripture, that neither rejecters of the Goſpel, nor wicked Chriſtians, nor even the Devils themſelves, ſhall be condemned to any other Puniſhment, than bare ceaſing to be: For of all theſe, it is ſaid in ſeveral places of Scripture, that [ἀπολῦνται] *they ſhall periſh* or *be deſtroyed:* and thus you unwarily overthrow all the Threatnings of the Goſpel. Again, if when our Saviour ſays, *Joh.* 3. 19. that *This is the condemnation, that Light is come into the World, and Men love Darkneſs rather than Light*; his plain meaning be not this, that the clear Revelation of the Will of God made to Mankind in the Goſpel, and the expreſs denunciation of his Wrath againſt Sin,

is

is the great *Aggravation* of Impenitence, and that which makes Mens obſtinately continuing in their Sins utterly inexcuſable, and their condemnation evidently moſt juſt, becauſe they cannot now pretend ignorance of their Duty; but the Words [Αυτη ἡ κρίσις] *This is the Condemnation*, muſt ſignifie a *particular Kind* of Puniſhment to be inflicted upon Men for *Aſſociating with the Devil* as being the *Prince of Darkneſs*; I cannot ſee but by the ſame Liberty, any Aſſerter of any new Opinion may interpret any part of Scripture ſo as to countenance any the moſt groundleſs Fancy or Imagination whatſoever.

Is it not a very weak Hypotheſis, to imagine that the Souls of Men muſt needs be naturally Mortal, becauſe otherwiſe God would not know how to diſpoſe of the Souls of the Heathen; *ſince there cannot be any third Eternal State, ſuitable to the Nature of a Rational Soul; neither happy, nor miſerable; as there muſt be, if thoſe Souls be naturally Immortal?* (*Præmon.* p. 43.) Is not the Univerſe large enough, for God to diſpoſe of all his Creatures into States ſuitable to their Natures? Are

Are there not in Gods *Houſe many Manſions?* Or will Heaven and Hell be two ſuch Places, in which there will be no Differences of States, no ſpace for Order and variety of degrees? Does not our Saviour himſelf expreſſly tell us, that they who *knew not their Maſters will, and yet did things worthy of ſtripes, ſhall be beaten with few ſtripes?* And does not *St Paul*, in the whole 2d Chapter to the Romans, plainly declare that Gentiles as well as Jews ſhall be judged according to their Works?

The reſt of your Præmonition, being upon a different ſubject, I forbear to conſider at this time.

IN the Diſcourſe itſelf (*Sect.* 2,) you propoſe a moſt dark and unintelligible Notion, concerning [ψυχὴ and πνεῦμα] *Soul* and *Spirit*; not only diſtinguiſhing the *rational Soul* from the *ſenſitive*; which was the Philoſophy of many of the Antients; but moreover making the *Spirit* different from both, and wholly præternatural to Man. The whole *natural* Soul (ψυχὴ,) including

both the *ſenſitive* and the *Rational* part, (which you elſewhere call the two Souls, *pag.* 220,) you ſuppoſe to be of it ſelf mortal, but to be made immortal in good Chriſtians by the addition of the *Spirit*, (by the *Acceſſion of an Adſcititious Spirit*, as you ſometimes expreſs it,) and in the rejecters of the Goſpel to be made immortal without it. If by the *Spirit* you mean only an *Operation* of the Spirit of God upon our Souls, than (as I obſerved before) there is no real difference between being immortalized by the *Spirit* and by the *Will* of God. But if by the *Spirit* you mean the addition of a new Subſtance or Principle of Subſiſtence to the Souls of good Chriſtians in order to immortalize them, which yet in them that reject the Goſpel are immortalized without that addition; Is not this juſt ſuch another ſuppoſition, as if you ſhould ſuppoſe the *Underſtanding* to be one Subſtance in a Man, and the *Will* another, and the *Habit of Virtue* a third; notwithſtanding that at the ſame time it be confeſſed that all theſe things may be Faculties or Powers of one and the ſame Subſtance?

And

And your perverting the words of *St Paul* to ſerve your obſcure Hypotheſis, is very groſs. Does *St Paul*, when he diſtinguiſhes the *natural Body* [ψυχικὸν σῶμα] from the *Spiritual Body* [πνευμα]ικὸν σῶμα,] and calls the one *corruptible*, the other *incorruptible*; mean that the *natural Body* [ψυχικὸν σῶμα] is therefore *corruptible* or *mortal*, becauſe the *Soul* [ψυχὴ] or *Principle of Life* which is in it, is itſelf a * *Mortal* Principle? Or that the *Spiritual Body* [πνευματικὸν σῶμα] is made *incorruptible* by the ſuperaddition of a new *Spirit* to the Soul that animates it? The plain meaning of *St Paul* is only this, that the Body which in this preſent ſtate is diſſolvible and *corruptible*, ſhall after the reſurrection, by the Power of God, be made *incorruptible*; without having any reſpect at all to the *Soul*; or the *Nature* of it, in his whole Diſcourſe. Again, when *St Paul* derives our Title to the *Reſurrection* of the *Body*, wholly from Chriſt; does he thereby mean to affirm, that, without the Reſurrection of Chriſt, the *Souls* of Men muſt alſo have ceaſed to exiſt? On the contrary, for that very reaſon, becauſe the Souls of Men would not

* *Pag.* 3.

have ceaſed to exiſt; therefore Chriſt thought them of value to redeem them from Miſery, by the purchaſe of his Blood, by his Death and Reſurrection. And 'tis the worſt repreſentation of Chriſtianity, that can be; ſomething that might indeed * *be thought hard dealing*; to ſuppoſe (as you do) that the Goſpel of Chriſt, which is every where in Scripture repreſented as the greateſt inſtance of God's tender Mercy and Compaſſion towards Men, ſhould upon the whole ſo *very diſproportionably* increaſe the Miſery of ſinful Men, as that whoever disbelieved or neglected that new offer of Grace and Favour, ſhould from thenceforth be condemned to everlaſting Torments; notwithſtanding that otherwiſe Sin, in its own Nature, againſt the Light of Reaſon and Conſcience and the natural Law of God, was ſo little heinous, that had it not been for the Offer of this new extraordinary Grace and Favour, they that had lived in the utmoſt contempt of God and of his natural and eternal Law written in their Hearts, and in the moſt unreſtrained practiſe of all poſſible wickedneſs, might have been ſafe from the fear of any other danger, than that of

* *Pag.* 5.

periſh-

periſhing finally by a natural Mortality.

Your Concluſion from our Saviours deſcription of the laſt judgment, *Mat.* 25, is very extraordinary; [*Sect.* 3;] that becauſe the *rewardableneſs* of the good Works of the Righteous, is there aſcribed to their having been done for *Chriſt's* ſake; therefore no other *Perſons* ſhall be concerned in that Judgment, but thoſe to whom the Goſpel had been made known. You might exactly as well have concluded, that becauſe *Charity* and *Uncharitableneſs* are the only particular Actions there mentioned, for which Men ſhall be adjudged to Reward or Puniſhment; therefore no regard ſhall be had to any other *Virtues* or *Crimes* in that final Judgment. It is evident by comparing other places of Scripture, that all kinds of *Actions* ſhall then be examined; and it is as evident, that all ſorts of *Perſons* ſhall be ſo too. Thoſe who never heard of the Goſpel, 'tis true, cannot be judged by the *ſame Rule or Form*, as thoſe who did hear of it; But is it not very wonderful, to conclude from thence, that becauſe * *ſuch perſons muſt be judged by another form* not fully and

* pag. 7.

expresſly (ſuppoſe) mentioned in Scripture, therefore that *form cannot at all be known* what it is; and if that *form could not be known, yet that therefore it ought not to be believed* that there is any ſuch form at all? Does not the ſame Light of Reaſon, which makes Men a *Law to themſelves*, neceſſarily diſcover alſo to them at the ſame time what Rule they ſhall be judged by? Neither is it true therefore, that no ſuch Form can be proved from the Scriptures: For does not St *Paul*, in the whole 2d Chapter to the Romans, largely declare that there is ſuch a Form, and alſo what that Form is? And does not the Scripture every where plainly ſuppoſe, that the Judgment ſhall be univerſal? The Phraſe of *judging the World*, Acts 17, 31, manifeſtly implies it; and the oppoſition between Death and Judgment *Heb.* 9, 27, though the ſtreſs of the Apoſtles argument does not indeed lie upon it, and the univerſal particle [*All*] is not added, yet very evidently ſuppoſes the *Judgment* to extend to the very ſame Perſons as *Death* doth. And what difference is there, between ſaying that 'tis appointed for *Men* once to die, or that 'tis appointed for *All Men* once

once to die? It is not a juſt anſwer here, to ſay that Univerſal aſſertions are frequently in Scripture to be underſtood in a limited Senſe. That can only be ſo, when either the common acceptation of the words, evidently limits their ſignification; as in that place you mention, *Joh.* 12, 19; or when ſome other parallel places of Scripture, expreſsly add a Limitation. Where this is not the caſe, as it is not in the phraſe of Gods *judging the World*, Acts 17, 31; the ſame expreſſion being in all other places of Scripture likewiſe univerſal; if limitations may be added arbitrarily and at pleaſure, there will then be no way left to diſtinguiſh at all, when any declaration is to be looked upon as *univerſal*, and when as only *particular*. You your ſelf are forced to allow the Jews, who lived before our Saviours coming, to be concerned in the Judgment; and not them only, but alſo Others who lived before the Law, in the Times of *Noah* and the Patriarchs; becauſe (*pag.* 11.) *as they were intitled to the Spirit in Reverſion, ſo they might be intitled to the Conſequences of the Spirit, one of which is Immortality.*

I ſuppoſe you will eaſily grant, that the Knowledge many of theſe Men had of Chriſt, was but implicit and very obſcure: And if that was ſufficient to intitle them to Immortality, why is it not as eaſy to ſuppoſe that the Promiſe God made to *Adam* might entitle all Mankind to have ſome benefit of the Redemption purchaſed by Chriſt, according to their different proportions and capacities, though they never heard of him explicitly?

It may here be obſerved alſo by the by, that, according to your obſcure and indeed confuſed manner of expreſſing your ſelf, you in this Section (*pag.* 8,) ſuppoſe *the Holy Spirit to immortalize Men to Puniſhment*; and again, (*pag.* 31,) that Men are *qualified* for *the higher degree of Puniſhment, by the Acceſſion of the adſcititious Spirit, which makes them* ἰσάγγελοι: Not very conſiſtently with your firſt diſtinction, (*Præmon.* Sect. 3,) that the actually immortalizing Souls to Puniſhment, may better be aſcribed to the *Pleaſure* of God, than to the *Divine Spirit*. Unleſs you will ſay, that bad Men within the Covenant, are immortalized to Puniſhment by one Principle; and bad Men without the Covenant

Covenant, or Rejecters of it, immortalized to Puniſhment by another Principle. And ſo there is no end of vain and groundleſs Imaginations.

That there ſhall be, as you ſay, (*Sect.* 4.,) *a very great difference in the Puniſhment of thoſe who reſiſt and reject the Goſpel, from what it would have been if they had never heard of the Goſpel*; is undoubtedly very true. But does it from thence follow, that God did not † *oblige* Men at all to *worſhip himſelf*, before any *revealed* Religion was inſtituted? Becauſe *the* * *Scripture does* indeed *every where ſuppoſe the Condition of thoſe who reſiſt the Goſpel-diſpenſation, worſe than that of the worſt ſort of Criminals who never heard of the Goſpel*; does it from thence follow, that they that never heard of the Goſpel, had therefore *no concern at all* in the final judgment? Becauſe our Saviour declares that it ſhall be *more tolerable* for *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* in the day of Judgment, than for thoſe who rejected the Goſpel when offered them; does it from thence follow, that thoſe wicked People ſhall not be caſt into * *outer darkneſs* at all? When our Saviour threatens

† *Pag.* 11, & 12.

* *Pag.* 13.

* *Pag.* 14

that

that *Capernaum*, *which was exalted to Heaven*, *ſhould be brought down to Hell*; is it not a very extraordinary Interpretation of the meaning of thoſe Words, and as wonderful an Inference from them, to conclude that thoſe People, if our Saviour had not preached to them, would have † *had no reaſon to fear the Puniſhment of Hell* at all? An unprejudiced Perſon would rather conclude on the contrary, that for that very reaſon, becauſe they *were in danger of it*, therefore our Saviour preached to them and exhorted them to *repent* and *flee from the* wrath to come. Laſtly, if they that never heard of the Goſpel, ſhall not indeed for their Unbelief be ſentenced to * *that Hell*, which was prepared for the Devil and his Angels; that is, to the *ſame degree of Puniſhment* with thoſe who reject or diſobey the Goſpel; yet does it at all from thence follow, that they ſhall have *no concern* in the general Judgment, upon account of their having obeyed or diſobeyed the Law of Nature?

† pag. 14.

* pag. 18.

The

The caſe (*Sect.* 6.) of that Text in St *John*, *Joh.* 5, 28 and 29; *The Hour is coming, in the which all that are in the Graves ſhall hear his Voice, And ſhall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Reſurrection of Life, and they that have done evil, unto the Reſurrection of Damnation*, is exactly the ſame with that before-mentioned, *Acts* 17, 31. The Words are *univerſal*; and the inſtances you bring of other *univerſal* Affirmations, which muſt be underſtood in a *limited* Senſe, have not the leaſt ſimilitude with the Text you are conſidering. If the *Gibeonites univerſal* Declaration to *David*, that *for them he ſhould not kill any Man in Iſrael*, muſt needs indeed be underſtood in a *limited* Senſe, becauſe they themſelves expreſly *limited* it by demanding ſeven of *Saul*'s Poſterity to be delivered to them to be put to Death: If *Ahab*'s ſending to *all* Nations and Kingdoms to ſearch for *Elijah*, muſt indeed of neceſſity, in the Nature of the thing it ſelf, be underſtood *only of thoſe that bordered* upon him: If St *Paul*'s *univerſal* Declaration, that he baptized none of the *Corinthians*, muſt indeed be underſtood with *an exception*; becauſe he himſelf

himſelf in the very next Words adds an *exception* expreſly: Is it juſt to infer from theſe Inſtances, that our Saviour's *univerſal* Affirmation in this place, concerning the Reſurrection, may likewiſe be underſtood in a *limited* Senſe, tho' neither in the Nature of the thing it ſelf, nor from the Context, there be any the leaſt Ground for ſuch limitation? nay though on the contrary, all the parallel Texts, which are very many, be likewiſe *univerſal?* It is a wonderful thing, to ſee in what manner *Learned* Men can argue, when Prejudices prevail over their *Judgment.*

Your 7th Section, to ordinary underſtandings, ſeems to be mere Confuſion. *You* ſuppoſe Man to conſiſt of three diſtinct parts, *Body*, *Soul* and *Spirit*: *But* they who made this diſtinction, ſuppoſed theſe three parts to be in *all* Men by *Nature*; which will not ſerve *your* purpoſe. *You* bring in *Plato* diſtinguiſhing *Mind* [Νοῦς] from [ψυχὴ] *Soul*, and making the one mortal, the other immortal: *But* this likewiſe, being ſpoken concerning the natural formation of all Men, is nothing to your purpoſe; For in *your* Hypotheſis,

theſis, you make the *whole* Man by nature Mortal. *You* mention *Plato* here (*pag.* 22 & 24,) and again *pag.* 59 & 96, and *Præmon. pag.* 21, as favouring your own Notions: *And yet* in other places, (as *pag.* 33, 60 & 66,) you inconſiſtently ſpeak of him as juſtly blamed for holding the contrary Opinion, *for aſſerting* Our *Doctrine of the Souls natural Immortality*, *pag.* 33. *You* affirm (*pag.* 23,) that there is no real difference between the Platonical Notions and thoſe of the new Teſtament, only that That which the Platoniſts call Mind [Νοῦς,] and make it Immortal, the Sacred Writers call [Πνεῦμα] *Spirit*, as being the *Divine Breathing*, Gen. 2, 7: *Here* you openly contradict your ſelf, making the immortal [πνεῦμα] *Spirit*, common to all Men by their original formation, and confounding it with what you elſewhere ſo * often, in alluſion to that very Text, diſtinguiſh by the name [πνοὴ] *Breath*, and make it mortal. *You* bring in *Philo* diſtinguiſhing the immortal Soul from the *ſenſible formed Man*, as you darkly expreſs it; *But* even this alſo is directly againſt you: For *Philo*, oppoſing the *immortal Mind*

* *Præmon. pag.* 21 & 25; *and in the Diſcourſe itſelf*, pag. 160 & 216.

of

of Man, that is, the rational Soul, both to the Body and to the ſenſitive Soul, ſtill ſpeaks of them all as *original* and *natural* Parts of the Man; And therefore when you apply to your Hypotheſis of an *adſcititious Spirit*, what he ſays concerning this [πνεῦμα θεῖον] *Divine Spirit or Soul* infuſed into Man by Gods *breathing*, Gen. 2, 7; you again directly contradict your ſelf, by confounding the *Spirit* [πνεῦμα] which you ſuppoſe immortal, with the [πνοὴ] *Breath* or *Soul* which you make to be mortal. *You* cite (*pag.* 26) the words of *Aratus*, Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμεν, as approved by St *Paul*, Acts 17, 28: *But* if thoſe words prove any thing, they prove directly againſt you: For γένος θεοῦ, if it ſignifies any thing, ſignifies *Off-ſpring of God* in that Senſe which you oppoſe, (*page* 66.) And though you are pleaſed to underſtand them (*pag.* 66,) only of Thoſe that are immortalized by receiving or rejecting the Goſpel, yet St *Paul* on the contrary as plainly applies them to all that *dwell on the Face of the Earth*, as it could be expreſſed in words.

In the ſame Section, (*pag.* 22,) you call it *a precarious Fancy, to make every Cauſe*

Cauſe of Motion diſtinct from Matter, to be properly what we call a Spirit, Independent on Matter, and Immortal: Here you ſeem to ſuppoſe the *Soul* of Man, to be ſomething *diſtinct from Matter*; yet not a *Spirit*, nor *Independent on Matter*, leaſt from thence it ſhould follow that it was naturally immortal. In your Præmonition, *pag.* 25, you make the *Soul*, as being a mere *Flatus*, to have a *more* precarious ſubſiſtence even than *mere Matter* itſelf, ſaying that *it is unable to continue its own Duration by the Powers given it at its firſt Production, and the continuance of thoſe* general Influences *which are requiſite for the ſupport of Created Beings in general:* Yet in the ſame page (as I obſerved before) you ſay that Souls *do not ſo depend on any other Created Being, but that they may ſtill continue in their Duration, whatſoever other created Influences be withdrawn from them, if God be pleaſed ſtill to continue that* ordinary Providence *which is eſſentially neceſſary for their continuance:* This is making them properly Immortal. In the *Diſcourſe* itſelf, *pag.* 51, you ſuppoſe again that the Soul *may depend on Matter, as to* its *Being and Preſervation*, though

though it be not a *Modification of Matter*, but *distinct from it*: Here you expreſs your ſelf, as if you thought it a *Subſtantial Form*, a contradictory Chimæra, which aroſe merely from the miſconſtruction of a Greek Word in *Ariſtotle*, ſignifying indifferently either *Subſtantial* or *Eſſential*: And again, *pag.* 91, you ſuppoſe in like manner, that the Soul is *ſomething diſtinct* both *from Spirit*, and alſo *from Matter and Motion*; that is to ſay, a *Material Form*; an *active Subſtantial Principle*, *diſtinct from Matter*, *yet depending on Matter*, in eſſe, in fieri, in operari, *and which muſt accordingly be diſſolved on the diſſolution of that Matter on which it depends.* In *pag.* 220, you ſuppoſe, on the other hand, the *Two Souls* (as you call them) to be not only *diſtinct*, but alſo *ſeparable*: And *pag.* 218, you ſeem to incline to the Notion of thoſe Philoſophers, who *owned the* πνοὴ *to be material like the ſteams of odoriferous Bodies*; *Which Conſideration alone*, you ſay, *is ſufficient to cut it off from any pretenſions to any proper natural Immortality.* Is not all this, the greateſt Extravagancy and Confuſion that can be? Did not the World know you

you to be a ſerious Perſon, theſe things would look much more like the Raillery of an Unbeliever, than the Reaſonings of one that in earneſt intended to eſtabliſh any conſiſtent Notion. In reality, That the Soul cannot poſſibly be *Material*, is evident not only from the conſideration of its noble Faculties, Capacities and Improvements, its large Comprehenſion and Memory, its Judgment, Power of Reaſoning, and moral Faculties; which Arguments have been urged with unanſwerable Strength by the wiſeſt and moſt conſiderate Men in all Ages, from the times of *Socrates* and *Plato* to this very Day; but the ſame thing is moreover demonſtrable from the ſingle conſideration, even of bare Senſe or Conſciouſneſs it ſelf. For *Matter* being a diviſible Subſtance, conſiſting always of ſeparable, nay of actually ſeparate and diſtinct parts, 'tis plain, that unleſs it were eſſentially Conſcious, in which caſe every particle of Matter muſt conſiſt of innumerable ſeparate and diſtinct Conſciouſneſſes, no Syſtem of it in any poſſible Compoſition or Diviſion, can be an Individual Conſcious Being: For, ſuppoſe three or

three hundred Particles of Matter, at a Mile or any given diſtance one from another; is it poſſible that all thoſe ſeparate parts ſhould in that State be one individual Conſcious Being? Suppoſe then all theſe Particles brought together into one Syſtem, ſo as to touch one another; will they thereby, or by any Motion or Compoſition whatſoever, become any whit leſs truly diſtinct Beings, than they were when at the greateſt diſtance? How then can their being diſpoſed in any poſſible Syſtem, make them one individual conſcious Being? If you will ſuppoſe God by his infinite Power ſuperadding Conſciouſneſs to the united Particles, yet ſtill thoſe Particles, being really and neceſſarily as diſtinct Beings as ever, cannot be themſelves the Subject in which that individual Conſciouſneſs inheres, but the Conſciouſneſs can only be ſuperadded by the addition of Something, which in all the Particles muſt ſtill it ſelf be but one individual Being. The Soul therefore, whoſe Power of Thinking is undeniably one Individual Conſciouſneſs, cannot poſſibly be a *Material* Subſtance. And if it be neither *Matter* nor any *Modification of Matter*, then (tho' you

are

are pleaſed to † affirm ſomewhat raſhly, and without offering any reaſon for your affirmation, that ſuch *Reaſoning is far from being Self-evident*, yet) it is really as notoriouſly Self-evident as any thing in Nature, that it *cannot poſſibly depend upon Matter, as to its Being and Preſervation.* For if even one particle of Matter *cannot poſſibly depend upon another, as to its Being and Preſervation*, (which I believe you will confeſs to be Self-evident,) becauſe they are each of them diſtinct Beings; muſt it not be even yet leſs poſſible, for a Being which is neither Matter itſelf, nor a Modification of Matter, but entirely *diſtinct* from Matter, *(pag. 51;) to depend on Matter as to its Being and Preſervation?*

† *pag.* 51.

It is not indeed of any great moment in the preſent diſpute; but it ſeems to ſhow in general ſomething of haſt and inconſiſtency in your Notions; what you affirm concerning the Giants, *Sect.* 8. who, you ſay, deſcended from the *Sons of Seth* and the *Daughters of Cain*; and yet in the very ſame Paragraph you call them the *Off-ſpring of the Fallen Angels*; and, upon their account, make

two *defections* of Angels, one before the Fall of Adam, the other before the Flood.

You proceed (*Sect.* 9) to the Authority of the Fathers. *Juſtin Martyr*, whom you begin with, ſays indeed expreſly, that the Soul ought not properly to be called *Immortal*: But this he ſays, not, as you repreſent him, in oppoſition to *our* Doctrine, nor yet in oppoſition to *Plato*, but in oppoſition to the extravagant Notions of ſome † *pretended Platoniſts*, who taught ſuch an *Immortality* as implied *neceſſity of exiſtence*. For, the reaſon he gives why Souls ought not to be called *Immortal*, is becauſe * *they had a beginning*, and *depend continually upon God for the Preſervation of their Being*. In which ſenſe, neither are *Angels* Immortal; but * *God only*. All that he ſays therefore, does not in the leaſt imply, but that the Soul may be ſuch a ſubſtance, as is able to continue its own Duration for ever, by the Powers

† Εἰ ἀθάνατός ἐϛι ψυχὴ, ἀγέννητο ἄρα ἐϛί. ἀγέννητο δὲ μόνον ἀθάνατο ἐϛι κατά τινας λεγομένους πλατωνικούς. *Dialog. cum Tryph.*

* Ἀναγκη μὲν τὰς ψυχὰς γεγονέναι· —— οὐκ ἄρα ἀθάνατοι, *ibid.*

† Μόνος γὰρ ἀγέννητο καὶ ἀφθάρτο ὁ Θεός. *ibid.*

Powers given it at its first Production, and the continuance of those general Influences which are requisite for the support of Created Beings in general; Which is all that we mean by *natural Immortality.* Nay, that he did actually think the Soul to be in this sense *Immortal*, may justly be gathered from those very words which you your self cite from him: Ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν ἢ φθαρτὸς &c, *What* Plato *thought concerning the World, that it must needs indeed be in its Nature capable of being destroyed and brought to an End, because it had a beginning; yet that God would never actually destroy it: The same may be thought concerning the Soul, and concerning all things that are or can be, excepting only God himself,* (εἰ καί τε ἐξαφανισθῆναι) *that they are capable of being destroyed:* Which last words seem clearly to explain what he means by the word [φθαρτὸν] *corruptible*, which he applies not only to the Soul of Man, but also to all Created Beings whatsoever; namely, not to signify any Tendency to Corruption in the Nature of the thing itself, but only a Dependence upon the Will of God, in opposition to Self-existence. He does indeed

ſay, that the Souls of the Damned ſhall continue to exiſt *as long as God thinks fit*; and implies as if he thought they ſhould finally be deſtroyed, after very long Puniſhment: But this, not by a natural Mortality, but by the Will of God, who is as able to deſtroy if he thinks fit, as to create: Which Opinion, if there was any ground for it, would yet ſignify nothing at all to your purpoſe.

Tatians Opinion, if it was of any Authority, would prove too much for you. For he fancied that the Soul was diſſolved with the Body, and roſe again with it at the Reſurrection. This part you pleaſantly call his *Humane Reaſoning*, (*Sect.* 10;) as if you thought all the reſt of what he ſays in the very ſame ſentence, was *immediately Divine*. Yet even *He* alſo is expreſsly againſt you. For as he makes *all* Souls to die with the Body, ſo he makes them *all* to riſe again with it alſo; leaving none of them in their natural Mortality; but raiſing them all, either to eternal Happineſs, or [θάνατον διὰ πωρείας ὑπ ἀδικίαν λαμβάνουσα] to Immortal Puniſhment.

Irenæus

Irenæus is ſo very full and expreſs againſt you, and your perverting of his words ſo very groſs, that with the ſame liberty any perſon might eaſily make any Author ſeem to countenance any Hereſy or abſurd Opinion whatſoever, even from the very words themſelves, wherein he with all poſſible clearneſs expreſſes himſelf againſt it. The paſſages which you your ſelf cite, are as clear and plain as can be deſired. He in expreſs words (as you your ſelf cite them,) declares the Soul *to* * *be immortal in its own nature*, and affirms that it does † *not die*. To evade this, you ſuppoſe he means only, that the Soul does not *die in the ſame Manner* that the Body does, namely by *ceaſing to breathe*; A more ſurprizing evaſion could not poſſibly have been invented: His words, which the Reader would expect you ſhould have tranſcribed at length, are theſe; that † *'tis the Body*

* Quæ ſunt natura immortalia; quibus a ſua natura adeſt vivere. *lib.* 5. c. 4. † *ibid. c.* 7.

† Hæc [*caro*] enim eſt, quæ morietur & ſolvitur; ſed non Anima, neq; Spiritus. Mori enim, eſt vitalem amittere habilitatem, & *ſine Spiramine* in poſterum, & inanimalem & immobilem fieri, & deperire in illa, ex quibus & initium ſubſtantiæ habuit. Hoc autem neq; Animæ evenit; flatus eſt enim vitæ: neq; Spiritui; incompoſitus eſt enim & ſimplex Spiritus, qui reſolvi non poteſt. *lib.* 5, § 7.

only that dies, not the Soul: For, to die, is to loſe the Powers of Life; Breath, *Senſe and Motion*; *and to be ſeparated into its firſt Principles of Compoſition*; *which the Soul, the Flatus vitæ, and the Spirit which is a ſimple and uncompounded and indiſſolvible ſubſtance, cannot be:* Is not the word [*Spiramen*] *Breath*, in this ſentence, an excellent ground for your diſtinction; that *Irenæus* by denying that the Soul dies, does not mean to deny that it dies, but only to deny that it dies in the ſame Manner the Body does, *viz.* by ceaſing to breath? Again, He expreſſly affirms, that † *the Soul and Spirit is not mortal:* By this you ſay he means only, that the Soul does not *actually* die *When the Body dies*; But, being aſhamed of this Interpretation, you add immediately, that he means alſo further, that the Soul *in its own Nature, does not conſiſt of contrary Principles, tending to a Diſſolution by its own Nature, as the Body does:* This is expreſſly giving up the whole Queſtion; and directly contrary to what you add preſently after, that *Death is natural to the Soul, on account of its natural*

† Οὔτε δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ ἄνητον, οὔτε τὸ πνεῦμα, *lib.* 5, 13, as the words are cited by you: & *lib.* 5. 7, *almoſt the ſame words again.*

tural conſtitution. It is here further to be obſerved alſo, that theſe laſt words which you your ſelf cite out of *Irenæus*, that *the Soul and Spirit is not Mortal*, [οὔτε ἡ ψυχὴ οὔτε τὸ πνεῦμα,] are directly contradictory to the Notion you advance, *pag.* 3, concerning [σῶμα ψυχικὸν] *the natural Body's* being therefore oppoſed to [πνευματικὸν] 1 *Cor.* 15, 44, becauſe it has only a *Mortal* Principle [ψυχὴ] in it; and alſo directly contradictory to what you inſinuate *pag.* 41, concerning *Irenæus's* underſtanding [πνοὴ ζωῆς] *the Breath of Life*, Gen. 2, 7, to be, what *You* all along would diſtinguiſh it to be, a *Mortal* principle: Which he is indeed ſo far from doing, that, on the contrary, he, in that very Chapter from whence you have taken moſt of your Citations, declares [ψυχὴ] *the Soul*, not to be mortal, for * that very reaſon becauſe it is [πνοὴ ζωῆς] *the Breath of Life*, Gen. 2, 7. Notwithſtanding that he does indeed, at the ſame time, contradiſtinguiſh it,

* Quæ ſunt ergo mortalia corpora? nunquidnam Animæ? Sed incorruptibiles Animæ, quantum ad comparationem mortalium corporum. Inſufflavit enim in faciem hominis Deus *flatum vitæ* (Gen. 2, 7.) & factus eſt in animam viventem; *Flatus* autem *vitæ*, incorporalis eſt. Sed ne mortalem quidem poſſunt dicere hominem ipſum flatum vitæ exiſtentem. Et propter hoc David ait; Et anima mea illi vivet; tanquam immortali ſubſtantia una ejus exiſtente. *lib.* 5, *c.* 7.

as

as St *Paul*, does from πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν; The πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν being plainly with him, as it is with St *Paul*, that divine Power which Spiritualizes and Immortalizes, not the *Soul*, but the *Body* at the Reſurrection.

Irenæus does indeed, with other Antient Writers, allow, that whatever is γεννητὸν *or had a beginning*, muſt be φθαρτὸν, that is, as *Juſtin Martyr* expreſſes it, Οἱόν τε ἐξαφανισθῆναι, *capable of being deſtroyed.* But this is only meant (as the Antitheſis of the words [γεννητὸν] and [φθαρτὸν] evidently ſhows) of the Nature of the Soul as oppoſed, together with that of Angels and of all other the higheſt Created Beings whatſoever, to That Immortality which ariſes from *Neceſſity of Exiſtence*, which muſt needs be peculiar to God alone: Which is nothing to *Your* purpoſe.

I cannot ſee how you collect any thing at all from *Athenagoras*, (*Sect.* 12.) He does indeed diſtinguiſh Νοῦς from ψυχὴ according to the old Philoſophy; but he does not found any thing upon that diſtinction, which is in the leaſt to *your* purpoſe. He neither affirms the *Soul* to be mortal, nor makes

makes any doubt but the *Bodies* of all Men ſhall riſe again unto Judgment. All you pretend to gather from him, is, that the *Soul* is not itſelf ſufficient to immortalize the *Body*: But to this you have your ſelf given a full Anſwer, that *No body* ever thought it was.

The words you cite from *Theophilus Antiochenus*, (*Sect.* 13,) relate wholly to the Queſtion concerning the ſtate of *Adam* in Paradiſe, whether he was Created Mortal or Immortal in *that State*: Nothing therefore can be gathered from thence, concerning the Nature of a *ſeparate Soul*. *Theophilus* determines, that He was *neither Mortal nor Immortal* * originally by his Creation; that is, (as you your ſelf explain it, *pag.* 46,) God neither deſign'd for him *Corporal Death*, nor *Corporal Immortality*; but he was capable of being either, according as he ſhould behave himſelf: But whether *Adam* before his Fall was in that Senſe naturally *immortal*, or naturally

* Note, your Emendation, ἐγῶμαι for ἐγὼ μέν, in this paſſage of *Theophilus*, is without ground. For the Senſe is not, [οὐδὲ τοῦτο, ἐγῶμαι,] *not ſo, I ſuppoſe*, but [οὐδὲ τοῦτο, ἐγὼ μέν,] *I dare not aſſert That neither, for my part*; anſwering to [οὐδὲ τοῦτο φαμεν] in the preceeding line; As any one that pleaſes to compare your Book, may obſerve.

naturally *mortal*; what is this to the *Soul*? which, ſuppoſing *Adam* never ſo *mortal*, you your ſelf acknowledge does not periſh by *that mortality* which denominates a Man *Mortal*, that is, the Diſſolution of the Body.

His ſaying that from That Text, *Gen.* 2, 7, *moſt Men* [πλείονες] ſtiled the *Soul immortal*; does not imply (as you imagine) that *Theophilus* himſelf thought it *mortal*; but it implies ſome doubt concerning the proper uſe of the word ἀθάνατος, which (as has been before noted) ſeemed to many of the Antients to imply as much as ἀγέννητος *Neceſſarily-exiſting*, (in the Senſe that *St Paul* ſays of God, 1 *Tim.* 6, 16, ὁ Μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν, that *He only hath Immortality*;) or at leaſt to ſignify an *indefectible State* of Virtue and Happineſs: And therefore it is, that he ſays concerning *Adam*, Εἰ ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐποιήκει, θεὸν ἂν ἐποιήκει: *If Adam had been made originally immortal, he had been made a* God.

It is alſo further to be obſerved from this paſſage of *Theophilus*, that the Text you ſo frequently allude to, *Gen.* 2, 7, was παρὰ τοῖς πλείοσι *by moſt of the Antients*, underſtood in a Senſe directly

rectly contrary to your Notion of the πνοὴ signifying in that place a *Mortal* Principle. And it is with very extraordinary difficulty, that you here labour to ſuppoſe, that [πλείονες] thoſe *moſt Men* whom *Theophilus* affirms to have collected the *Immortality of the Soul* from this *Text of Scripture*, were not *Chriſtians*, but either *Jewiſh Phariſees* or *Heathen Philoſophers*: Which Suppoſition, of Heathen Philoſophers proving the Immortality of the Soul from a Text of Scripture; and that a Chriſtian Writer ſpeaking of moſt Mens Senſe concerning a Text of Scripture, ſhould thereby mean the Senſe of Heathen Philoſophers; This, I ſay, with all that follows in that Section, is ſo extremely abſurd, as to need no Confutation.

Tertullian does indeed ſuppoſe the Soul to be *Material*; From whence it muſt alſo neceſſarily be confeſſed to follow, that it would be *naturally Mortal*; and no one can (as you ſay, *Sect.* 14,) believe ſuch a Soul as he ſuppoſes, to be independent on Matter in its own Nature. All this is very true; and yet *even This* ſeems to be nothing to

your

your purpoſe. For though the *natural Mortality* of the Soul is indeed a neceſſary *Conſequence* of *Tertullian's* Doctrine; yet, ſince *Tertullian* did not ſee nor own that Conſequence; and, if he had ſeen the Conſequence, would have diſowned the Doctrine; his *Authority* (which is what you would make uſe of) is not for you, though the *Conſequence of his Doctrine* be: And therefore you are guilty of a very manifeſt Fallacy, when you ſay (*pag.* 55.) that *the Church had not declared againſt this Doctrine of* Tertullian, *which ſuppoſed the Souls natural Mortality*: For his Doctrine did not *then* ſuppoſe it, tho' *our* Philoſophy ſhows it to be indeed a Conſequence. He ſays expreſſly in many places of his Book *de Anima*, that the Soul *is Immortal*: He reckons this among thoſe Opinions of the Philoſophers which gave occaſion to Hereſies, that * *ſome of them denied the Immortality of the Soul*: He denied † *that the Soul grew or increaſed in ſubſtance*, notwithſtanding he thought it Material; *leaſt it ſhould follow from thence, that it was capable likewiſe*

* Alii immortalem negant Animam. *cap.* 5.

† Cæterum animam ſubſtantia creſcere negandum eſt, ne etiam decreſcere ſubſtantia dicatur, atq; ita & defectum credatur. *cap.* 37.

wiſe of periſhing: He ſtrongly * *oppoſes* the Opinion of thoſe who thought the Soul *received Nouriſhment; leaſt from thence likewiſe it ſhould follow that it was liable to periſh:* He expreſſly affirms, † that *all Mankind*, without exeption, *ſhall riſe again to eternal Happineſs or Puniſhment:* And many other ſuch Paſſages are to be found in his Works. You ſeem to be aware of this, when you ſay, that *Tertullian does indeed own the actual Immortality of the Soul:* But then, what you inſinuate in your next Words, [Eſpecially *of all who were, upon that account, obliged to come over as Proſelytes upon the Publication of the Goſpel,*] is extremely unfair; ſince *Tertullian's* Words, being every where as univerſal as can be, are directly contrary to what *you* would inſinuate by the Word *Eſpecially.*

* Auferenda eſt Argumentatoris occaſio, qui, quod anima deſiderare videatur alimenta, hinc quoq; mortalem eam intelligi cupit, quæ cibis ſuſtineatur, deniq; derogatis eis evigeſcat, poſtremo ſubtractis intercidat. *cap.* 38.

† Reſtituetur *omne humanum genus* —— exinde in immenſam æternitatis perpetuitatem. *Id. in Apologetico.*

And here upon occaſion of the Paſſages you cite out of *Tertullian*, concerning *the Propagation of the Soul ex traduce*, and its having a *Humane Shape* and *Difference of Sex*; I cannot forbear pro-

propoſing it to your more calm and ſerious conſideration, whether your manner of citing the Fathers, by picking out chiefly ſuch Sentences, wherein for want of Philoſophy they were evidently miſtaken, and which can only be of diſſervice to Religion, and tend to confirm profane Men in their Mockery and Contempt; is not a very ill repreſentation of thoſe Writers, and a very ill manner of ſhowing your regard to them. I believe, ſhould any other Perſon do the like upon any other Philoſophical Subject, you would immediately look upon him as doing it with an ill deſign, and deſerving a very ſevere Cenſure.

What you ſay (*Sect.* 16.) concerning *Tertullian*'s deriving the Humane Soul from the *Flatus Vitæ* mention'd *Gen* 2, 7; proves, not that he thought the Soul Mortal, becauſe you groundleſly interpret that Text ſo; but that he underſtood that Text contrary to what you have done, becauſe he clearly declares the Soul derived thence to be Immortal: As I have before ſhown particularly concerning *Irenæus*. And what you offer in the reſt of that Paragraph,

ragraph, concerning *proper Immortality* belonging only to God, is all entirely againſt your ſelf, and not in the leaſt againſt our Notion; as has likewiſe been proved before.

The words you cite out of *St Cyprian*, (*Sect.* 18) are evidently nothing to your purpoſe; being ſpoken only concerning *regeneration* or the *new birth* in the *moral* Senſe, without any the leaſt hint of any *natural* mortality of the *Souls* of thoſe who are *not regenerated*. *Arnobius*, you your ſelf acknowledge to *have his Paradoxes on this Subject*; that *he was but a Catechumen, when he wrote his book*; and *was not truly inſtructed in the Chriſtian Doctrine*. *But*, you ſay, *he is more to be regarded, when he ſpeaks conformably to the Senſe of other Catholick Doctors of that early Age*, that is, when you think he ſays any thing agreeable to that Notion which you not truly attribute to the Fathers. And yet even *He*, does not ſay any thing really agreeable to that Notion. For though he does indeed blame the boldneſs of certain Platoniſts for ſuppoſing the Soul to be * *neceſſarily Immortal*, to

* Animus, qui immortalis a vobis & *Deus* eſſe narratur, &c. *lib.* 2.

have come from Heaven, and to return thither again of courſe at the diſſolution of the body; running out with much oratorical Liberty upon the weakneſs of thoſe Mens Arguments for the Immortality of the Soul; and does Himſelf contend that the Soul is of a † middle Nature, neither mortal, nor immortal, but capable of either condition according to its behaviour; yet all this he does purely upon *That* Argument, that whatever had a beginning, muſt alſo neceſſarily be capable of being deſtroyed; and that whatever is *paſſible*, muſt needs in its Nature be liable to periſh; and accordingly therefore applies it to Angels † and all other Created Beings whatſoever, in the very ſame Senſe as he does to Men: Which is not the Notion of Mortality *You* are contending for.

† Medietas ergo quædam, & animarum anceps ambiguaq; natura, *&c. lib.* 2.

† Omnes omnino, Dii, Angeli, Dæmones, aut nomine quocunq; ſunt alio, qualitatis & ipſi ſunt mediæ, & ambiguæ ſortis conditione mutabiles. *lib.* 2.

And when he ſuppoſes the Souls of the Wicked to periſh finally, (which you imagine to be for your purpoſe;) he underſtands it of *all* the damned, as well thoſe that *had heard* the Goſpel, as thoſe that *had not*; and thoſe that

had

had received the Spirit, as those *that had not*; conceiving them *all* to be destroyed by the Power of God inflicting such Punishment upon them, and not that *any* die by a *natural* mortality.

Lactantius is throughout his whole work as full and express against you, as any Author that ever wrote either before or since. So that your perverting his words to favour your Notion, is really, what upon second thoughts you yourself will hardly excuse. I shall first show briefly, how clearly he asserts the natural Immortality of the Soul, and then consider in how very extraordinary a manner you misrepresent him.

He approves * that Notion of *Plato*, which you † so often condemn, concerning the natural Immortality of the Soul: He declares, that * *the Soul does not perish, nor is dissolved, but endures for ever*: He is very large and particular in † confuting all *Lucretius's* Arguments against the natural Immortality of the Soul: He affirms, that *

* Licet verum de animæ immortalitate sentiret, &c. *lib.* 7. § 8.

† *pag* 33, 66, &c.

* Apparet, animam non interire, neq; dissolvi, sed manere in Sempiternum. *lib.* 7. § 9.

† *lib* 7, § 12 &c.

* Quod ex terra fuit, in Terram resolvitur; quod ex cælesti Spiritu, id constat ac viget Semper; quoniam divinus Spiritus sempiternus est. *lib.* 7, § 12.

at Death *the Body returns to the Earth; but That part of ourſelves, which God breathed into us, endures and lives for ever*; And again; that † *the Soul is not corruptible, but indures for ever; becauſe it proceeded from an eternal Original*: And concludes; * *I think*, ſaith he, *I have ſufficiently proved the Soul is not diſſolvible.* He expreſſes himſelf in the very ſame manner concerning the natural duration of wicked Souls, as of good ones. *The Effect of that Death*, ſaith * he, *which wicked Souls are ſubject to, is not the extinguiſhing of them, but the puniſhing them eternally: This Puniſhment we call the ſecond Death; which is itſelf alſo perpetual, as eternal Happineſs is; The ſecond Death, is the ſuffering eternal Torment; the damnation of Souls to eternal Puniſhment, according to their deſerts.* Again: *As the Life of the Soul*, ſaith †

† Ergo anima, quæ fragilis non eſt, in æternum manet; quoniam Origo ejus æterna eſt. *ibid.*

* Declaravi, ut opinor, animam non eſſe ſolubilem. *lib.* 7. § 13.

* Cujus [mortis] non ea vis eſt, ut injuſtas animas extinguat omnino, ſed ut puniat in æternum. Eam pœnam, ſecundam mortem nominamus, quæ eſt & ipſa perpetua, ſicut & immortalitas. —— Mors Secunda, eſt æterni doloris perpeſſio; Mors eſt animarum pro meritis ad æterna ſupplicia damnatio. *lib.* 2. § 12.

† Sicut Vita Animæ ſempiterna eſt, in qua divinos & ineloquibiles immortalitatis ſuæ fructus capit; ita & mors ejus perpetua ſit neceſſe eſt, in qua perennes pœnas & infinita tormenta pro peccatis ſuis pendet. *lib.* 7. § 11.

he,

he, *is eternal, in which it injoys divine and unſpeakable Happineſs; ſo its Death alſo muſt needs be eternal, in which it endures everlaſting puniſhment and endleſs Torments for its Sins.* And again: *Death,* ſaith * he, *does not deſtroy and extinguiſh the Soul, but ſubjects it to eternal Torments.* And that all this might not poſſibly be underſtood either of your *immortalizing Spirit*, or of the *mere Will and Pleaſure of God*, ſuſtaining the Soul and cauſing it to endure beyond the original capacity of its own nature; he adds expreſſly in the very next words, (as if he had foreſeen and deſigned to prevent your Hypotheſis,) that the reaſon why the Soul is ſubject to ſuch endleſs Puniſhments, is becauſe it was created originally immortal, and therefore cannot die: For *the Soul*, ſays † he, *cannot utterly periſh and be extinguiſhed, becauſe it has its Original from the Spirit of God* [he means that which you call the πνοὴ, *Gen.* 2, 7,] *which is eternal.* And again; in Anſwer to that Objection,

* Mors autem non funditus perimit ac delet, ſed æternis afficit cruciatibus. *lib.* 7, § 12.

† Nam interire prorſus anima non poteſt; quoniam ex Dei Spiritu, qui eſt æternus, originem cepit. *ibid.*

* Si eſt immortalis Anima, quomodo patibilis inducitur & pœnæ ſentiens? *lib.* 7, 20.

† Ejus naturæ reddi animas, ut, ſi non extinguibiles in totum, quoniam ex Deo ſunt, tamen cruciabiles fiant per corporis maculam, quæ peccatis inuſta ſenſum doloris attribuit. *ibid.*

* *how that which is immortal, can be capable of ſuffering*; he has theſe remarkable words: *Mens Souls*, ſaith † he, *though they are not capable of being utterly extinguiſhed, becauſe they are of Divine Original; yet by being immerſed in Senſe, and depraved by Sin, they become liable to Miſery and Torment.* And again: * *What wonder is it*, ſaith he, *if Souls, notwithſtanding that they are immortal, are yet capable of having puniſhment inflicted upon them by God?*

* Quid ergo mirum, ſi cum ſint immortales animæ, tamen patibiles ſint Deo? *ibid.*

Moſt of theſe Paſſages, which are as remarkably full and clear againſt you, as if the Author had written on purpoſe to oppoſe your Hypotheſis, you inexcuſably paſs over without notice. And from theſe Paſſages any one may eaſily obſerve, how very groſſly, I had almoſt ſaid beyond Example, you miſrepreſent thoſe other places which you *do* cite from him. The Paſſages which you cite, *pag.* 70, wherein *Lactantius* affirms *Immortality*, not to be the neceſſary Condition of our *Nature*, but the Reward

Reward of our *Virtue*; are all plainly meant not of Perpetuity of Duration, (which he every where affirms to belong neceſſarily to our Nature,) but of the eternal indefectible Happineſs of Heaven; which this Author always means by the Word *Immortality*, as alone deſerving that glorious Title; notwithſtanding that at the ſame time he expreſsly and conſtantly affirms the oppoſite State to be of equal duration and perpetuity. Thus when, ſpeaking of that ſecond Death, *which* he ſays * *does not extinguiſh wicked Souls, but ſubjects them to endleſs miſery*, he ſays, that That likewiſe is of *perpetual Duration*, as *Immortality* alſo is; 'tis evident that by *Immortality* he means to expreſs, not Duration, but Happineſs: And in the place which you cite to prove that he did not think *Immortality* natural to Men, he in expreſs words declares that by *Immortality* he means † *the unſpeakable and eternal Happineſs of Heaven*: And when he ſays * *there would*

* Cujus non ea vis eſt, ut injuſtas animas extinguat omnino, ſed ut puniat in æternum. Eam pœnam, ſecundam mortem nominamus; quæ eſt & ipſa *perpetua*, ſicut & *immortalitas*. *lib.* 2, 12.

† Ne *Immortalitatem* delicatè aſſequerentur ac molliter, ſed ad *illud æternæ vitæ ineloquibile præmium* ſumma cum difficultate *&c.*

lib. 7. §. 5.

* Nam nihil intereſſet inter juſtum & injuſtum; ſiquidem omnis homo natus, *immortalis* fieret. *ibid.*

be no difference betwixt juſt and unjuſt, no ſuch thing as Reward and Puniſhment, if all Men were born Immortal; 'tis very evident from the Thread of his Diſcourſe, that he means, if Men were born originally, and without undergoing any Tryal, into ſuch a State, as * the *Good Angels* are now in, and the Saints ſhall be in after the Reſurrection, namely a State of Indefectible Virtue and Happineſs; then the Nature of Rewards and Puniſhments would be taken away. Again; Thoſe paſſages which you cite *pag.* 71, wherein you ſuppoſe that *Lactantius* by that *immortal Spirit*, which *God put or inſpired into an earthly Body*, means, not the *natural Soul of Man*, but the *Divine Spirit received in our Saviour's regenerating Baptiſm*, as a new *Principle of Immortality*; Theſe Paſſages, I ſay, if to any one that pleaſes to compare the places, they do not appear to be † all and every one of them clearly ſpoken on the contrary, concerning that *natural Soul*, which God is ſaid to have breathed into Man, *Gen.* 2, 7; it will not be eaſie to conceive how any Man can poſſibly expreſs his meaning

* Cum poſſet ſemper Spiritibus ſuis immortalibus innumerabiles animas procreare ſicut *Angelos* genuit, quibus *Immortalitas* ſine ullo malorum periculo ac metu conſtat, &c. *ibid.*

† *lib.* 7, 12. *lib.* 2, 12. *lib.* 7, 4 & 5.

ing in Words: And when from this Paſſage [*Ficto corpore, ſpiravit ei animam de vitali fonte Spiritus ſui, qui eſt perennis; ut ſi* Anima *ſuperaverit, quæ ex Deo oritur, ſit* Immortalis *& in perpetua luce verſetur,*] you infer that the Soul is Immortal, only *conditionally, if it be victorious*; your miſrepreſentation of the Paſſage, is very extraordinary: For the Words are not one entire Sentence, as any one would imagine them to be by your manner of citing them; but two Paſſages, at a Page diſtance from each other; And not *Anima* (as you ſeem to underſtand it) but *Homo* is the Nominative Caſe to *ſit immortalis & in perpetua Luce verſetur*; And ſo far is the Author from making the Souls Immortality *conditional*, by theſe Words; that directly on the contrary he in this very Sentence means to ſay, that the Soul muſt of neceſſity be *Immortal* in all circumſtances; only with this difference, that † if *a Man lives after the Spirit, his* Immortality *ſhall be a* Happy *one*; *but if he live after the Fleſh, his* Immortality

† Ex rebus diverſis ac repugnantibus *Homo* factus eſt; —— ut ſi Anima ſuperaverit, cuæ ex Deo oritur, ſit immortalis & in perpetua luce verſetur; ſi autem Corpus vicerit, —— ſit in tenebris ſempiternis & in Morte. Cujus [mortis] non ea vis eſt, ut injuſtas animas extinguat omnino, ſed ut puniat in æternum, *lib.* 2, 12.

muſt

be no difference betwixt juſt and unjuſt, no ſuch thing as Reward and Puniſhment, if all Men were born Immortal; 'tis very evident from the Thread of his Diſcourſe, that he means, if Men were born originally, and without undergoing any Tryal, into ſuch a State, as * the *Good Angels* are now in, and the Saints ſhall be in after the Reſurrection, namely a State of Indefectible Virtue and Happineſs; then the Nature of Rewards and Puniſhments would be taken away. Again; Thoſe paſſages which you cite *pag.* 71, wherein you ſuppoſe that *Lactantius* by that *immortal Spirit*, which *God put or inſpired into an earthly Body*, means, not the *natural Soul of Man*, but the *Divine Spirit received in our Saviour's regenerating Baptiſm*, as a new *Principle of Immortality*; Theſe Paſſages, I ſay, if to any one that pleaſes to compare the places, they do not appear to be † all and every one of them clearly ſpoken on the contrary, concerning that *natural Soul*, which God is ſaid to have breathed into Man, *Gen.* 2, 7; it will not be eaſie to conceive how any Man can poſſibly expreſs his meaning

* Cum poſſet ſemper Spiritibus ſuis immortalibus innumerabiles animas procreare ſicut *Angelos* genuit, quibus *Immortalitas* ſine ullo malorum periculo ac metu conſtat, &c. *ibid.*

† *lib.* 7, 12. *lib.* 2, 12. *lib.* 7, 4 & 5.

ing in Words: And when from this Paſſage [*Ficto corpore, ſpiravit ei animam de vitali fonte Spiritus ſui, qui eſt perennis; ut ſi* Anima *ſuperaverit, quæ ex Deo oritur, ſit* Immortalis *& in perpetua luce verſetur,*] you infer that the Soul is Immortal, only *conditionally, if it be victorious*; your miſrepreſentation of the Paſſage, is very extraordinary: For the Words are not one entire Sentence, as any one would imagine them to be by your manner of citing them; but two Paſſages, at a Page diſtance from each other; And not *Anima* (as you ſeem to underſtand it) but *Homo* is the Nominative Caſe to *ſit immortalis & in perpetua Luce verſetur*; And ſo far is the Author from making the Souls Immortality *conditional*, by theſe Words; that directly on the contrary he in this very Sentence means to ſay, that the Soul muſt of neceſſity be *Immortal* in all circumſtances; only with this difference, that † if *a Man lives after the Spirit, his* Immortality *ſhall be a* Happy *one*; *but if he live after the Fleſh, his* Immortality

† Ex rebus diverſis ac repugnantibus *Homo* factus eſt; —— ut ſi Anima ſuperaverit, cuæ ex Deo oritur, ſit immortalis & in perpetua luce verſetur; ſi autem Corpus vicerit, —— ſit in tenebris ſempiternis & in Morte. Cujus [mortis] non ea vis eſt, ut injuſtas animas extinguat omnino, ſed ut puniat in æternum, *lib.* 2, 12.

muſt

muſt be a miſerable *one:* When therefore you ſay, that *the way, according to Lactantius, taken by providence, for making Mans actual Mortality or Immortality the Reward or Puniſhment of his Free-will, was to joyn his Soul to his Body immediately, which being it ſelf Frail and Mortal, could not ſecure the Soul from actual Mortality*; and That *this he ſuppoſes would make the Complex of the Soul and Body actually Mortal*; You might with the *ſame Truth*, and with as much *appearance of Reaſon*, have ſaid, that *Lactantius* wrote his Book with a deſign to diſprove the whole Chriſtian Religion, or any other particular Article of it whatſoever. Again, when *Lactantius* ſays, that * *ſince this temporal Life is ſucceeded by temporal Death, it follows that the Soul muſt* riſe again *to eternal Life, becauſe temporal death has an End*; it is a very great and palpable miſrepreſentation, to infer from theſe words, (as you do, *pag.* 73,) that *Lactantius was ſo far from owning the Immortality of the Soul, as Natural to it, that he ſeems to own its actual Death,*

* Quia temporalem vitam temporalis mors ſequitur, conſequens eſt ut *reſurgant* animæ ad vitam perennem, quia finem mors temporalis accepit, *lib.* 7, § 10.

Death, for the ſpace between the Death of the Body and the Reſurrection; and therefore aſcribes the Reſurrection to the Soul as well as the Body: For what can be a groſſer miſrepreſentation of any Author, than from one ſingle Paſſage (even ſuppoſing that Paſſage not reconcilable with the reſt,) to affirm that his Opinion was juſt contrary to what he largely and expreſly almoſt in every Page of his Book declares it to be? But after all, this Paſſage is not difficult to be reconciled: For when he who ſays a hundred times in his Book, that the Soul has no dependence on the Body, but ſubſiſts as well and better after it is ſeparated from it, ſays in one ſingle paſſage that Mens Souls do [*reſurgere*] *riſe again* to eternal Life; can any thing be more evident than that his meaning is, that the Souls ſhall be † *united again* to their Bodies at the *Reſurrection* before the Judgment? It is an eaſy Figure, and very uſual in the beſt Authors, and in the Scripture it ſelf, to ſignify by the word [*Soul*] the ſame as [*Perſon*] in general: Thus *Gen.* 46, 26; *All the Souls that came with Jacob into Egypt*, &c. And *Lev.*

† A Deo corporibus induentur. *lib.* 7. 23. rurſus carne induentur ibid. 24.

Lev. 5, 2, *If a Soul touch any unclean thing*, &c. In which places, nothing can be more abſurd than to underſtand *Soul* in the ſtrict and proper Senſe of the Word: And yet there is juſt as much reaſon ſo to do, as, from the paſſage now cited, to conclude, that *Lactantius*, contrary to what he expreſſly declares in almoſt every page of his Book, was of Opinion that *the Soul died with the Body*. Had not the World deſervedly an Opinion of your great Learning, there would be no need to take notice of ſuch extraordinary miſconſtructions: Which really, Sir, in your repreſentation of this Author, appear to have proceeded from greater Prejudice, or greater Want of care, than Men of your known Abilities are ordinarily guilty of. At laſt you come off, *pag.* 75, with ſaying that *Lactantius*'s Reaſonings *either prove or are conſiſtent with a precarious Immortality; at leaſt even by our modern Reaſonings, do not imply any Neceſſity of an Immortality by Nature*: And who, I beſeech you, ever taught any other Immortality of the Soul, than a *precarious* one; that is, depending on the Pleaſure of God Almighty? or who ever imagined, that

any

any thing which was γεννητὸν and had a beginning, was not alſo capable of being deſtroyed and having an end, if God ſhould ſo pleaſe?

You begin with St *Athanaſius*, (*Sect.* 21,) very ominouſly; Acknowledging that he *does indeed own the Doctrine of the Souls Immortality, as a Doctrine of the Church*: Which he does, not only in * the words you cite from him, but alſo largely and fully in many other places of his *Oratio contra Gentes*; ſtiling the Soul † *rational and immortal*; affirming that * *when it is ſeparated from the Body, it will have a much clearer knowledge of its own Immortality*; and proving its Immortality diſtinctly, from ſeveral Topicks and Arguments: *If the Soul*, * ſaith he, *be diſtinct from the Body; as we have before ſhown; And the Body is mortal; It follows neceſſarily, that the Soul, being diſtinct from the Body,*

* Ὅπ ὃ χὴ ἀθάνατ☉ γέγονέν ἡ ψυχὴ, χὴ τῦτο ἀναγκαῖον εἰδέναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ. *Orat. cont. Gent.*

† Τί ἂν ἂν εἴη τῦτο πάλιν, ἢ ψυχὴ λογικὴ χὴ ἀθάνα[τ☉]; *ibid.*

* Πῶς ἐχὶ μᾶλλον χὴ πολλῷ πλέον, ἀπελυθεῖσα τ σώμα[τ☉], —— φαιδρωτέραν ἕξει τ τ ἀθανασίας γνῶσιν; *ibid.*

* Εἰ γὰρ ἄλλω ἀυτῷ ὁ λόγ☉ ἀπέδειξε πρὸς τὸ σῶμα· ἔστι δὲ τὸ σῶμα φύσ[ει] θνητὸν· ἀνάγκη τ ψυχὴν ἀθάνα[τον] εἶν), πλὴν μὴ ἐν) χτ τὸ σῶμα. *Ibid.*

must

must be immortal: And again; *The Soul,* ſaith * he, *therefore meditates and thinks upon things immortal and eternal, becauſe it is itſelf Immortal; For as the Body, being itſelf Mortal, has all its Senſes employed about mortal things; ſo the Soul, whoſe Faculties are employed about immortal things, muſt itſelf of neceſſity be Immortal and live for ever:* Theſe Arguments are plainly drawn from the *Nature* of the *Soul itſelf*, and are directly contrary to your Notion of an *Immortalizing Spirit* or *Will* of God: And accordingly, ſpeaking of the Heathens, he expreſſes himſelf in the very ſame manner concerning *Their* Souls in particular; *If they pretend to believe*, ſaith † he, *that they have a Soul, and value themſelves upon their Rational Faculties, as they juſtly may; why, as if they had no Soul, do they act contrary to Reaſon, and not think as they ought to do, but make God a Being meaner than themſelves*

* Διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἀθάνατα καὶ αἰώνια λογίζεται καὶ φρονεῖ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀθάνατός ἐστι καὶ ὥσπερ τὸ σῶμα θνητοῦ τυγχάνοντος, θνητὰ καὶ αἱ τούτου θεωροῦσιν αἰσθήσεις· οὕτως ἀθάνατα θεωροῦσαν καὶ λογιζομένην τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀνάγκη καὶ αὐτὴν ἀθάνατον εἶναι καὶ ἀεὶ ζῆν. ibid.

* Εἰ δὲ ψυχὴν ἀξιοῦσιν [al. ἀυχοῦσιν] ἔχειν, καὶ ὅτι τῷ λογικῷ μέγα φρονοῦσιν, εἰκότως τοῦτο ποιοῦντες διατί, ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες ψυχὴν, οὐδὲ λόγον τολμῶσι, καὶ οὐκ ἃ δεῖ φρονεῖν φρονοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κρείττονας ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τὸ Θεῖον ποιοῦσι; ψυχὴν δὲ ἀθάνατον ἔχοντες καὶ μὴ βλεπομένην αὐτοῖς, τὸν θεὸν ἐν τοῖς βλεπομένοις καὶ θνητοῖς ἀπεικάζουσιν. ibid.

ſelves

ſelves? For, having themſelves an Immortal *and inviſible Soul, yet they make God like to things viſible and mortal.* When therefore to *Athanaſius's* general Aſſertion concerning the *Immortality of the Soul*, you anſwer, that That does not concern your Cauſe, becauſe your Queſtion is not whether the Soul be *Immortal*, but whether it be *Immortal in its own Nature*; you are guilty of a very great Fallacy: For if by the Souls being *Immortal in its own Nature*, you intend to expreſs, what we mean, that the Soul by the Powers given it at its firſt Creation is naturally able to continue for ever; then *Athanaſius's* Aſſertion *does concern* your Cauſe; becauſe, in all the places now cited, he expreſſly maintains the *natural Immortality* of the Soul in that Senſe: But if by *Immortal in its own Nature*, you mean *neceſſarily Immortal*, as God is; then neither *Athanaſius*, nor we, nor perhaps any Body elſe ever meant that the Soul was *Immortal in its own Nature.*

From the Paſſages therefore now cited, wherein *Athanaſius* ſo expreſſly and very largely aſſerts the *natural Immortality* of the Soul, 'tis very reaſonable to conclude,

clude, that all thoſe Paſſages in his Book *de Incarnatione verbi Dei*, which you underſtand to imply a *natural Mortality of the Soul*, ought (that they may not be inconſiſtent with what he ſo fully and expreſſly aſſerts elſewhere,) to be underſtood concerning that natural Mortality which is the Diſſolution of the Body and Separation of the Soul, without determining what becomes of the Soul after that Separation. And thoſe Paſſages may the better be underſtood in that Senſe, becauſe they are all ſpoken concerning that Mortality *Adam* incurred by his Sin in Paradiſe; the Conſequence of which Mortality, (with reſpect to the State of the Soul ſeparated thereby from the Body,) antecedent to the Promiſe of Chriſt, was not a Queſtion neceſſary to be entred into. And this is ſtill the more confirmed by This, that even thoſe Phraſes, θανάτῳ κρατήσαντος, φθορᾶς παραμενούσης, ἐν τῷ τοῦ θανάτου φθορᾷ μένειν, and the like; which ſeem at firſt ſight to make the moſt for your purpoſe; 'tis plain need not be underſtood to expreſs the *total Extinction or utter Annhilation* of *Adam*, if Chriſt had never been promiſed; but either his having no ground to expect any

any Reſtoration to his former ſtate by a *Reſurrection of the Body*; which ſeems to be the meaning of them in ſome places; or elſe (which is evidently their Signification in ſome other places,) *Death's continuing to prevail and extend it ſelf over his Poſterity:* Thus, *When Adam had ſinned*, ſaith* he, *Death entred into the World; and this Deſtruction prevailed more and more over the whole Race of Mankind. For Men encreaſed and multiplied their Sins beyond meaſure: And therefore Death prevailing more and more, and this Deſtruction continuing to have Dominion over Men, the whole Race of Mankind was loſt.*

* Τῦτο ὃ ἠμοιῶτο, ὁι μὲ ἀνθρωποι ἀπέθνησκον, ἡ ὃ φθορὰ λοιπὸν κατ' αὐτῶν ἤκμασεν. καὶ πλεῖον ἔτι καὶ φύσιν ἰσχύσα καθ' ὅλε τὲ ἡμᾶς —— καὶ γὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς παλαιμελήμασιν οἱ ἀνθρωποι ἐκ ἀλόγως ὅρων ὠθισμῶν εἰσήλασαν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ὀλίγον ἐπεκτεινόμενοι, λοιπὸν καὶ εἰς ἄμετρον ἐλισθάσι.---- Διὰ δὴ ταῦτα πλεῖον ἔτι θανάτε κρατήσαν]ος, καὶ ἡ φθορὰ ἐπαύξησε καὶ ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων, τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ἡμᾶς ἐσθείρετο. *De Incarnat. Verbi.*

The ſame thing (namely that the Phraſes before-mentioned do not ſignifie the total extinction of *Adam*, both Soul and Body, if Chriſt had never been promiſed; but only That Mortality, which is the diſſolution of the Body and ſeparation of the Soul;) may alſo be gathered from thoſe other Expreſſions of the ſame Author in his Book

de Incarnatione Chriſti, from ſome of which you very unreaſonably endeavour (*pag.* 85,) to conclude the direct contrary. For when he ſpeaks of the Souls being held [ἐν δεσμοῖς] *in Bonds*, and [ἐν δεσμοῖς θανάτου] *in the Bonds of Death*; 'tis plain this does not ſignifie the *Extinction* of the Soul, but its *Confinement to* [Ἅδης] *the ſeparate State.* And therefore, ſpeaking of Chriſt's delivering Men from that Mortality which was the Conſequence of *Adam*'s Sin, he ſaith;

* *To that place where the Body of Man was corrupted, thither did the Body of Chriſt go; and to that Place, where* the Soul of Man was detained *in Death, thither did Chriſt go with his Humane Soul*, &c.

* Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὅπου διεφθάρη τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶμα, ἐκεῖ ἐφοίτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα· καὶ ὅπου κεκράτητο ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐν θανάτῳ, ἐκεῖ ἐπεδείκνυτο ὁ Χριστὸς τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ ψυχῇ ἰδίαν οὖσαν, &c. *De Incarn. Chriſti contra Apollinar. lib.* 1.

In which Paſſage 'tis evident, that by the Words [κεκράτητο ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ Ἀνθρωπίνη ἐν θανάτῳ] *the Soul of Man was detained in Death*, is not meant the *Extinction* of the Soul, but its *Confinement to* [Ἅδης] *that ſeparate State*, to which the Soul of Chriſt deſcended. And in that very Paſſage, where from the Souls being concerned in the Sentence [θανάτῳ ἀπολείπειν] *thou*

ſhalt

ſhalt ſurely dye, you would infer the *Extinction* of the Soul; if you had cited the Words at length, it would have appeared that *juſt the contrary* was intended: The Words are theſe; *God*, ſaith † he, *paſſed upon Man a double Sentence of Puniſhment; ſaying to his earthly Body, Duſt thou art, and unto Duſt ſhalt thou return; and ſo the Body turned unto Corruption; And to his Soul, Thou ſhalt ſurely die; and ſo the Man was ſeparated, and condemned to depart into two different places:* From the laſt of which Words it is very evident, that by applying that Threatning [θανάτῳ ἀποθανῇ] *thou ſhalt ſurely dye*, to the Soul; he did not mean its *Extinction*, but its *Separation* and *Confinement to* [Ἅδης] *the ſeparate State.*

† Διπλῆν τ τιμωείας τ ἀπόφασιν δέδωκε τῷ μὲ γπίνῳ εἰρηκὼς, Γὴ εἶ, κ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ· κ ὅτως ὑποδέχε φθορὰ τὸ σῶμα, δεσπότε ἀποτηναμένε. τῇ δ ψυχῇ, θανάτῳ ἀποθανῇ· κ ὅτω διχῇ διαιρεῖ ὁ ἄνθρωπ, κ ἐν δυσὶ τόποις οἰχεῖ καταδικάζε. ibid.

Your laſt citation out of this Author, (*pag.* 86,) is very remarkable. Againſt certain Hereticks who taught that the Soul was *corporeal*, he argues from thoſe Words of our Saviour, *Fear not them that kill the Body, but cannot kill the Soul. If*, ſaith * he, *the Soul* ἐν ἅδῃ κατεχομένας ψυχὰς, πνεύματα ἀνόμασας, &c. *De adventu Chriſti contra Apollinar. lib.* 2.

* Πῶς, εἰ σαρκικὴ ἦ ψυχὴ καθ' ὑμᾶς, ἃ σωθνῄσκ τῷ σώματ κ συμφθείρε; πῶς δ κ ὁ Πέ ῥ τὰς

be, as you Appollinariſts contend, corporeal; why cannot it be killed and periſh with the Body? and why doth St Peter, *ſpeaking of ſeparate Souls, call them Spirits? Here,* you ſay, *the* [σαρκικὴ ψυχὴ] fleſhly or corporeal Soul, *is plainly oppoſed to the* [πνευματικὴ] Spiritual Soul, *and for that reaſon is ſuppoſed as capable of being killed by Men, as the Body it ſelf.* Is not this very extraordinary? when the plain and expreſs meaning of *Athanaſius*, is to ſhow that there can be no ſuch thing at all as [σαρκικὴ ψυχὴ] *a fleſhly or corporeal Soul*; becauſe, if there was, it would be capable of being killed, which our Saviour ſays cannot be.

All that you ſay, *Sect.* 23, ſeems to be utterly Unintelligible: And thoſe words in particular, *pag.* 91, (which I have before had an occaſion to take notice of,) where you ſuppoſe the Soul to be *Something diſtinct* both *from Spirit*, and alſo from *Matter and Motion*; that is to ſay, a *Material Form*; an *active Subſtantial Principle, diſtinct from Matter, yet depending on Matter* in eſſe, in fieri, in operari, *and which muſt accordingly be diſſolved on the diſſolution*

of

of that Matter on which it depends: Theſe words, I ſay, appear ſo very abſurd and contradictory in themſelves, that no Confutation of them can be ſtronger than the bare tranſcribing them.

You ſeem very certain, *Sect* 24, that your Doctrine can have no *ill influence* upon Mens preſent *Practiſe*; becauſe, though you aſſert indeed the *natural Mortality* of the Soul, yet you teach at the ſame time, that the Souls of all thoſe, who hear of the Goſpel, whether they imbrace it or no, ſhall be *actually immortalized*; and ſo bad Men can take no advantage of the Doctrine concerning the *Natural Mortality* of the Soul, to encourage themſelves in their Wickedneſs with the Hopes of Impunity. But can you really think, Sir, that it is a thing of no ill conſequence in Practiſe, to raiſe new diſputes, to fill the Minds of weak and unſtable Men with endleſs doubts and Scruples, and the mouths of the profane with new Topicks of Scepticiſm and Raillery, againſt the moſt important and fundamental Doctrines of all Religion? Or can you be indeed per-

ſwaded, that ſuch Men as are pleaſed with ſome of your Notions, will as readily admit all the reſt alſo? You are forced to make a new and diſtinct Hypotheſis upon every particular occaſion: You firſt ſuppoſe the Soul of Man naturally Mortal; and then, to ſecure to good Men the Unchangeable State of Heaven, you are forced to ſuppoſe *their* Souls præternaturally immortalized to Happineſs by the Divine Spirit: Yet, becauſe all who receive that Divine Spirit, do not ſo behave themſelves as to be capable of the Happineſs of Heaven, you are forced (though † unwillingly) to ſuppoſe ſome of them immortalized by the ſame Divine Spirit to Puniſhment: And after this, leaſt thoſe who reject the Goſpel and never receive the Divine immortalizing Spirit at all, ſhould take advantage of the Souls natural Mortality to encourage themſelves with hopes of Impunity in their Wickedneſs, you are forced to ſuppoſe *Their* Souls made immortal without any immortalizing Principle at all, by the mere Omnipotence and Arbitrary Pleaſure of God. Now, all theſe Hypotheſes appearing very precarious and independent on each other; is it not very obvious to perceive, that profane

† *Præmon. pag.* 21, compared with your *Diſcourſe pag.* 8 & 31.

Men

Men will very gladly and with great advantage make uſe of all your Arguments for the *natural Mortality* of the Soul; and drop the following parts of your Hypotheſis? And indeed I cannot ſee, but you muſt in ſome meaſure be anſwerable for this ill Conſequence. For it is not enough to prevent the natural and obvious ill conſequences of an Hypotheſis, that a Learned and ingenious Man is able to invent ſuch further Suppoſitions, and to find out ſuch Shifts and Diſtinctions, by which he ſhall think he can evade the force of thoſe Conſequences. There is hardly any Opinion ſo extravagant or of ſo miſchievous conſequence, but an ingenious Man may maintain it in ſuch manner, as that upon his whole Hypotheſis it ſhall not be eaſy to charge him with any ill conſequence, for which he will not be able to find ſome evaſion: And yet he that maintains it, muſt nevertheleſs be anſwerable for ſuch ill Conſequences, as are naturally apt to follow from the Opinion it ſelf, without the additional Hypotheſis which are made uſe of to ſalve it. The Epicureans, who taught that *Pleaſure was the chief Good*, when they were charged

with the obvious ill Conſequences of that Doctrine, were provided to make ſuch ingenious Explications of it, that they thought themſelves abundantly able to evade all thoſe ill Conſequences that could be drawn from it: Yet that Doctrine was evidently a very pernicious Doctrine; and they who maintained it, could not be excuſed (as *Cicero* has largely ſhown) from being anſwerable for thoſe Conſequences, which were but † too naturally drawn from it by the generality of Men, who would not attend to the Subtilties and Diſtinctions of thoſe Philoſophers. He that will ſuppoſe Men to have *no Souls at all*, but that their Life is entirely extinguiſhed at the Diſſolution of the Body; and at the ſame time ſuppoſes that at the Reſurrection their Life ſhall be reſtored again, and continue for ever; will be ſure to pretend that no ill Conſequence can be drawn from his Doctrine, becauſe he ſuppoſes Men actually and in event as much Immortal, as if they *had Souls really diſtinct from their Bodies*: And yet I believe you your ſelf make no doubt but That Opinion is a very per-

† Quaſi ego id curem quid ille *aiat* aut *neget*: Illud quæro, quid ei *conſentaneum* ſit dicere, qui &c. *Cicero.*

pernicious one. He that will affirm that there is no other Subſtance in the World but *Matter*; and at the ſame time ſuppoſes Matter capable of all the ſame Powers and Attributes, which we aſcribe to Spirit; may likewiſe with the ſame reaſon pretend, that no ill Conſequence can be drawn from his Opinion: And yet no Body can doubt but ſuch an Opinion leads directly to Atheiſm. 'Tis not therefore ſo very clear, as you ſeem to ſuppoſe it to be, that none of thoſe Conſequences are to be charged upon you, which (if your whole Hypotheſis be granted) you can find indeed a way of evading.

You attempt to prove (*Sect* 25) that *the Immortalizing Principle was generally believed no Ingredient in the Nature of the Humane Soul among the Heathens themſelves*; by ſaying, that *the popular Heathens believed only their firſt Anceſtors to have been Gods, their next to have been Heroes or Demi-Gods, and the later generations to have been pure Men; Unleſs the Supreme Being were pleaſed (even in the degenerous Ages) to confer the nobler Principle on ſome choice Favourites.* Here you ſeem to *forget*, that the *popular Heathens* (as you call them) had all

a Notion of *Elyſian Fields* and of a *Tartarus*, that is, of a Place of future Happineſs or Miſery, where the Souls of thoſe which you call *pure* or mere *Men* were to be diſpoſed of, either to continue there for ever, or to come out upon new revolutions, but not to be extinguiſhed. Yet preſently after, (*pag.* 96) you ſay that, by the oldeſt Tradition, *all Souls were ſuppoſed to have the Divine Principle connatural to them*; And the reſt of the Section is wholly ſpent in explaining the Notions of thoſe whom you call (*pag.* 100) the *Traditional travelling Philoſophers*, who believed that Human Souls underwent many Purgations and different Revolutions, but that *no part of the divine ſeed might periſh finally*; and that *all Humane Souls were thus far at leaſt of a divine extraction, not as the Notion of Divine might intitle them to infinite Perfection, but as it might at leaſt intitle them to Immortality*: All which is ſo far from being any thing to your purpoſe, of proving that *the Immortalizing Principle was generally believed no ingredient in the Nature of the Human Soul among the Heathens themſelves*; that on the contrary it ſeems to me to prove rather directly againſt you. *Sect.*

Sect. 26, You all along confound either *neceſſary Immortality*, or elſe the Notion of *Præ-exiſtence* and Revolutions of Souls, with *natural Immortality*. That which any of the Primitive Chriſtians blamed *Plato* and *Origen* for, was not their aſſerting the *Immortality* of the Soul, but its *Præ-exiſtence* and everlaſting *Revolutions*. Their Maxim, that *whatever had a Beginning, muſt therefore be capable likewiſe of having an End*, does not at all prove againſt *natural*, but only againſt *neceſſary Immortality*, that is, *neceſſary and independent Exiſtence*: As is evident from what you your ſelf obſerve, that *upon this Principle they owned none Immortal but God himſelf*; *No, not the Angels*; And that the Apoſtle affirms of God, [Ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν, 1 *Tim.* 6, 16,] that *He only* has Imortality, *as being the* αὐτοαθανασία *from whom All that will pretend to Immortality, muſt derive it, and not from their own Nature*; that is, not from the *Neceſſity of their own Nature*, but from the *Will* of God, who was pleaſed to create them *Immortal*, and upon whom (notwithſtanding their Immortality, that is, notwithſtanding their natural Power of continuing for ever,

ever, without being liable to be deſtroyed by any created Force,) they nevertheleſs continually depend for their Preſervation.

Ariſtotle, by affirming the immortal Soul to be [θυράθεν] *from without*, means plainly that it is *Something diſtinct from the Body*, and not (as you interpret him *pag.* 101,) that it is *not ingredient in the Conſtitution of Mankind in general*, or (as you † elſewhere expreſs your ſelf) that it is a *præternatural Principle*; as if, *naturally*, Men had no rational Souls at all.

† *Præmon. pag.* 24. and *Diſcourſ.* I. 300.

The other Maxim you mention, *That nothing that is paſſible can be Immortal*, proves likewiſe only againſt *neceſſary*, not againſt *natural Immortality*. For a thing's being capable to be acted upon, does not at all prove that it is capable of being deſtroyed by any natural Power. Every perfectly ſolid Particle of Matter it ſelf, is incapable of being deſtroyed or even divided by any Power of Nature, though it is as capable of being moved and agitated and acted upon, as any compound Body. The Soul may in like manner be very capable of ſuffering, and of being acted upon; and yet it will not at all follow, that

it

it is capable of being deſtroyed by any natural Power. Thoſe of the Antients, who *proved that the Soul of the rich Man in the Parable, muſt have been Corruptible, becauſe it ſuffered Torment*; you acknowledge prove at the ſame time that *it muſt* likewiſe *have been Corporeal:* But the *Corporality* of the Soul, you know, was taught only by one or two Men. The reſt were all of a different Opinion. And *Lactantius* is very particular and expreſs in anſwering that Objection; † *If the Soul be immortal, how then is it paſſible and capable of enduring Puniſhment? and if it be capable of pain, how is it not capable of Diſſolution?* The Anſwer he gives, is; firſt, * *that* (according to the Notion of the Stoicks) *the Souls of Men, though by reaſon of their Divine Original they cannot indeed be extinguiſhed, yet by being immerſed in Senſe and depraved by Sin, they may become liable to Miſery and Puniſhment:* Secondly, † *that*

† Si eſt immortalis anima; quomodo patibilis inducitur, ac pœnæ ſentiens? *lib.* 7, § 20.

* Ejus naturæ reddi animas, ut ſi non extinguibiles in totum, quoniam ex Deo ſunt, tamen cruciabiles fiant per corporis maculam, &c. *ibid.*

† Tantam eſſe Dei poteſtatem, ut etiam incorporalia comprehendat, &, quemadmodum voluerit, afficiat. Nam & Angeli Deum metuunt, &c. Quid ergo mirum, ſi cum ſint immortales animæ, tamen paribiles ſint Deo? *ibid.* § 21.

that though We indeed do not know how Immaterial Things can be acted upon, yet God has as much Power over them, as over corporeal things: And laſtly, * *that in order to endure Puniſhment, the Souls ſhall again be united to their Bodies.* All which paſſages undeniably ſhow that *Lactantius* did not think the Soul naturally corruptible, and preſerved præternaturally by the Power of God; but, on the contrary, that the Soul was naturally Immortal, but by the Power of God made capable of enduring Puniſhment.

* Sed tamen docent nos ſanctæ literæ, quemadmodum pœnas impii ſint laturi. Nam quia peccata in corporibus contraxerunt, rurſus carne induentur, ut in corporibus piaculum ſolvant. *ibid.*

If there was any ſtrength in the Argument you make uſe of, *Sect.* 27; that *becauſe the* actual *Immortality of the Soul is a Revelation of the Goſpel, therefore it is not capable of being proved by Reaſon from the Nature of the Soul itſelf*; It would follow by the ſame argument, that *Moral Obligations*, becauſe they are *Revelations* of the Will of God in the Goſpel, therefore are not capable of being proved by Reaſon, from the Nature of God, of Men, and of Things. Some things revealed in the Goſpel, are

are indeed of ſuch a Nature, that they could not have been known *at all* without Revelation: But Others (of which the *Immortality of the Soul* is one,) are ſuch as were capable of being in great meaſure diſcovered by the Light of Nature and right reaſon; but yet by the Revelation of the Goſpel, are made known with much greater *Certainty*, greater *Clearneſs*, greater *Authority*, and in a *Manner* much better *fitted* to all *Capacities*. This ſeems to be the proper meaning of the word [φωτίσαν] 2 *Tim.* 1, 10,] *has brought to Light*, has *clearly diſcovered*, has *univerſally and evidently made known*, that which before was but *obſcurely*, and *difficultly*, and *imperfectly* underſtood. The Alluſion you ſuppoſe to be between the words, [*has brought Life and Immortality to* Light *through the Goſpel*,] and thoſe other words of the Apoſtle, [*an Inheritance incorruptible, that fadeth not away, of the Saints in* Light,] is indeed ſome little Similitude of Words; the word *Light* being uſed in both places; but not the leaſt Alluſion or Similitude in Senſe. And indeed you ſeem your ſelf to be conſcious of the weakneſs of your Argument in this whole

whole Matter; by your ſaying that
† *pag.* 106. the Immortality of the Soul, *at leaſt* † *in Heaven*, is plainly ſuppoſed not to be known without divine Revelation;
* *pag.* 104. and again, *At leaſt* * *as to the giving us that immortal Life in Heaven*; and, That the Immortality of the Soul could not have been otherwiſe known
† *pag.* 106. with † *that Certainty* that might *ſupport the Practiſe which Religion expects in conſequence of it*; and again, That it could
* *pag.* 104. not have been known, at *leaſt* * *with that Aſſurance* which was *requiſite for the Practiſe which Religion requires purſuant to the Belief of it.*

That the *Sadducees* (*Sect.* 28,) denied the *Immortality of the Soul*, is very true; But then it is worth obſerving, that the ſame Men aſſerted alſo that there was *no Reſurrection, neither Angel nor Spirit*, Acts 23, 6. Your interpretation of which words, is very extraordinary. *What is the meaning of* Spirit *here, as it is joyned with* Angel, you ſay *is manifeſt: It is that* Immortalizing Spirit *which makes us* Ἰσαγγέλους, *that is, Immortal and entitled to Heaven, as well as the Angels are: That ſame Spirit indeed, by which the Angels themſelves*

ſelves are entitled to Immortality.—— This therefore oblig'd them [the Sadducees] *to deny the actual immortalizing of either Angels or Humane Souls, when they denied them Both that Spirit which could alone immortalize them.* Theſe Words, I think, need no Reflexion to be made upon them.

Your Interpretation (*Sect.* 31,) of that Text, 1 *Cor.* 15, 22, *As in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive*; ſeems very forced and unnatural. You underſtand it to ſignifie, that as All who deſcended from *Adam*, muſt die; ſo All who are in Chriſt, that is, all Chriſtians, ſhall be made alive. But this Interpretation, if it was true, would prove too much for you; namely, that thoſe only who embraced, not thoſe who rejected the Goſpel, ſhould be raiſed again: And the general tenor of Scripture, which every where declares that Unbelievers, who never were *in Chriſt*, ſhall be raiſed to Condemnation; ſhows plainly that your Interpretation of this Text is wrong. And how the falſe Notion certain Hereticks had of a metaphorical Reſurrection, 2 *Tim.* 2, 18, tends

to prove that St *Pauls* true account of the literal Reſurrection, is to be underſtood in a particular and limited Senſe; is not eaſie to conceive.

Your inference in the ſame place, againſt the Univerſality of the Reſurrection, from what the Apoſtle ſays concerning *Baptiſm*; ſeems likewiſe wholly precarious. For the Apoſtle does not in this Chapter ſay any thing, by which he might ſeem to ground the Reſurrection upon *Baptiſm*: But only, arguing againſt thoſe who pretended to be Chriſtians, and yet did not believe the Reſurrection of the Dead, he ſhows how abſurd it was for ſuch Perſons to be *baptized*, and thereby to expoſe themſelves to ſuch hazards as they muſt unavoidably do by their profeſſing Chriſtianity, if they had no expectation of a Reſurrection from the Dead. Whatever be the meaning of that difficult Phraſe, of being *baptized for the Dead*; the ſtreſs of the Argument plainly lies upon theſe Words, *And why ſtand we in Jeopardy every Hour?* That *Baptiſm*, whatever it was, expoſed them to ſome hazard, and gave occaſion to their being perſecuted; and the Apoſtles argument is, that it was

fooliſh

fooliſh for them to expoſe themſelves to ſuch danger needleſly and to no purpoſe, if there was to be no ſuch thing as a Reſurrection from the Dead. The Apoſtle grounds the reaſonableneſs of being baptized, and of embracing Chriſtianity, which was a perſecuted Religion; purely upon the hopes of a Reſurrection from the Dead: But he does not at all ground the Reſurrection upon Baptiſm, nor ſays any thing which does in the leaſt inſinuate that the Reſurrection ſhould not be univerſal.

The Concluſion you draw (*Sect.* 32,) from what St *Paul* teaches, *Rom.* 5, is very obſcure. The Summ of the Apoſtles Doctrine there, is, that That Condemnation which was brought uponMen by *Adam*, they are delivered from by Chriſt. How you can infer any thing from thence, againſt the univerſal Immortality of the Soul, I do not perceive. You ſuppoſe that thoſe over whom Death reigned between the Times of *Adam* and *Moſes*, were extinguiſhed by a total Mortality both of Soul and Body; But the Death there ſpoken of, is plainly the ſame Death to which all o-

ther Men likewiſe are ſubject; For 'tis not ſaid, that Death reigned over *Them only*; but that Death reigned *even* over them alſo, as well as over the reſt of Mankind; notwithſtanding that they had not ſinned againſt any poſitive Law, as *Adam before*, and thoſe who lived under the Law did *after*; but were ſubject to Death, only as it was a natural Conſequence of *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion: To infer from hence, that their Souls as well as Bodies, were ſubject to that Mortality, is begging the Queſtion which was undertaken to be proved. Thoſe who are ſubject to Death, in conſequence of *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion, are indeed ſtiled *Many*, *ver.* 15 and 19; as thoſe to whom the Benefit of Chriſt's Death redounds, are alſo in the ſame place ſtiled *Many*: But thoſe *Many* who die thro' the Offence of One, are, *ver.* 12 and 18, expreſly called *All Men*; and there is no good reaſon to ſuppoſe, but that the Death of Chriſt, who was promiſed immediately upon the Fall of *Adam*, may conditionally extend its Virtue, and Benefit, under different Diſpenſations, to All Men likewiſe. To ſay that the Dominion of Death, ſignifies in this place ſomething

thing peculiar, under which *all Men are not included*; becauſe the Apoſtle affirms that *Death reigned from Adam to Moſes, even over them that had not ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adam's Tranſgreſſions*; is very ſingular and groundleſs: For the Dominion of Death is not there *confined* (as you ſuppoſe it) *to the ſpace between Adam and Moſes*; ſo as to ſignifie a particular kind of Death prevailing at that Time, an extinction of Soul as well as diſſolution of the Body; But the Apoſtles aſſertion is plainly This, that in Conſequence of *Adam's* Tranſgreſſion, Death (in the common acceptation of Mortality) reigned in that ſpace of time alſo, even over them that had not tranſgreſſed any poſitive Law *after the ſimilitude of Adam's Tranſgreſſion*, as well as over thoſe who had in their own Perſons diſobeyed poſitive Laws. From whence how any thing can be collected to *your* purpoſe, is very difficult to imagine.

Whether that Text, *Joh.* 1. 9, *That was the true Light, which lighteh every Man that cometh into the World*; was ever alleged by Any, *to prove that an Immortalizing Spirit is given to every Par-*

ticular by Chriſt himſelf; I cannot tell. But I think your Interpretation of it, (*Sect.* 33,) is utterly unintelligible. *The* † *pag.* 136. πνοὴ, you † ſay, *is That which our Apoſtle* here *makes in all Men, [in every Man that cometh into the World,] inlightned by the Viſitation of the* Λόγος, *as an external Principle: Yet ſo as not to make any change in the Nature, in the Perſon ſo inlightned, without peculiar divine Favour, and diſpoſitions in the recipient, for ſuch an Union with the* Λόγος, *as may qualify it for the divine Favour of raiſing it above its own Nature: Till then, they are ſeparable again, and this external Viſitation of the* Λόγος, *leaves the viſited* ψυχὴ *as Mortal as it found it, where there is no particular deſign of God for immortalizing it to Puniſhment.* What the meaning of this, and all that follows in that Section, is; and how you collect it from the fore-cited Text of *St John*; is not, I believe, poſſible to be underſtood.

When *St Paul* ſays, 1 *Theſſ.* 4, 16, that the *dead in Chriſt* ſhall *riſe firſt*; Theſe words do not indeed prove that there muſt afterwards be a reſurrection of them that never heard of Chriſt; becauſe

becauſe the *dead in Chriſt*, which are here ſaid to *riſe firſt*, are not, 'tis true, oppoſed in this place to the dead *out of Chriſt*, but to them that ſhall be found *alive in Chriſt* at the time of the judgment: (Where note by the by, that you † miſinterpret this Text, by oppoſing the *dead in Chriſt*, and which are ſaid to *riſe firſt*, not, as the Apoſtle does, to them that ſhall be found *alive in Chriſt*, but to *thoſe who had been formerly in Chriſt and did not die in him*, or to *thoſe who might have been in him if they had pleaſed, but never were in him actually.*) But other places of Scripture, as has been before ſhown, do ſufficiently prove the Univerſality of the Reſurrection: And particularly that parallel Text, 1 *Cor.* 15, 23; where the ſame Apoſtle ſays, that *every Man* ſhall be raiſed *in his own Order*; *Chriſt the Firſt-fruits, afterwards they that are Chriſts at his coming*; And *then cometh the end* &c. Which words being immediately ſubjoyned to that univerſal declaration, *As in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive*; cannot, without great force, be interpreted to any other Senſe, but that *the End* muſt ſignifie the general Reſurrection of

† *pag.* 141.

all the dead. See *Rev.* 20, *v.* 5,12 & 13.

Your Interpretation (*Sect.* 35) of that Text, Rom. 2, 12, *As many as have ſinned without Law, ſhall alſo periſh without Law, and as many as have ſinned in the Law, ſhall be judged by the Law*; is not only groundleſs; the word [ἀπολοῦνται *ſhall periſh*] which you underſtand to ſignifie *Annihilation* or *bare ceaſing to be*, being evidently Synonymous to [κριθήσονται *ſhall be judged*;] But alſo (as I before obſerved upon your *Præmonition*, *Sect* 6,) you thereby overthrow all the Threatnings of the Goſpel, which frequently expreſs the Puniſhment even of the worſt of Sinners by that ſame word [ἀπολοῦνται *ſhall periſh*] which you here interpret to ſignify only *a bare ceaſing to be.* You are your ſelf ſenſible of this difficulty, *pag.* 143; where you confeſs, that *though the word, Periſh, may bear that milder Senſe of only ceaſing to be, yet it is alſo uſed in the Scriptures, concerning them whom all muſt believe liable to the ſevereſt poſitive Inflictions.* You ſeem indeed ſenſible, I ſay, of this difficulty upon your Interpretation: But yet you give no anſwer to it: Only you ſay,

pag.

pag. 144, that though *the word will indeed bear a larger Signification, yet in this place Annihilation may perhaps be more natural.* Is not this a very singular manner of arguing? To † collect from the ſignification of the word ἀπολῶνται, that thoſe of whom it is here ſpoken, ſhall only ceaſe to be; and yet at the ſame time to confeſs that in other places of Scripture That word has no ſuch ſignification; only, *in this place, Annihilation may, perhaps, be more natural.*

† See *Præmon. pag.* 35.

Your Interptetation of thoſe other words of the Apoſtle, that *when the Gentiles which have not the Law do by nature the things contained in the Law, theſe having not the Law, are a Law unto themſelves*; is no leſs extraordinary; Namely, that the Gentiles being a *Law unto themſelves*, does not ſignify their Obligation to obey the Law of nature, with reſpect to future rewards and Puniſhments; but only their * *owning the Reaſonableneſs of the things impoſed as a Law by God on the Jews, but not on themſelves*; which *would no further oblige Them to the Obſervation of them, than as their own Intereſts might prevail with them to obſerve them, as they would*

* *pag.* 144.

would avoid the Puniſhments and obtain the Rewards of Providence in This Life. Is not this very wonderful; that the Gentiles ſhould be able to judge of the *Reaſonableneſs* of Gods moral Law to the Jews, and yet not be ſenſible that the *Reaſonableneſs of the Thing* laid a ſtrong Obligation upon themſelves alſo? Or that they ſhould be ſenſible of an Obligation laid upon them to live virtuouſly (which it would ſometimes happen they could not do without expoſing even their Life itſelf,) and yet not have any ground to expect a future Judgment, nor any other Rewards and Puniſhments than in the preſent Life? Is not this, deſtroying the very Nature of Virtue and Vice; and contrary to ſome of your own arguments, *Sect.* 47, *and elſewhere?*

It is not a very conſiſtent Notion, to ſuppoſe as you do, (*Sect.* 35, 36, *and elſewhere.*) that the Souls of Men, though naturally mortal, yet are neither diſſolvedwith their Bodies, nor yet periſh afterwards by any natural Decay; but ſurvive, and continue to ſubſiſt in a ſeparate State; and none of them ever periſh actually by that decay

cay and Mortality which you ſuppoſe natural to Them; but that thoſe who ſhall neither be immortalized to Happineſs nor to Puniſhment, ſhall yet ſubſiſt till the general Judgment, and then be diſſolved by that *exquiſite fire which is to prevail in the laſt Conflagration, at leaſt ſo far as to deprive them of any ſenſibility of Pain.* Is not this Notion more properly a ſuppoſing them to be naturally Immortal, that is, capable of ſubſiſting for ever by the Powers given them at their original Production; but that God, by the interpoſition of his Almighty Power, præternaturally deſtroys at the laſt day, ſuch of them as are neither capable of eternal Happineſs, nor yet deſerve eternal Puniſhment? This certainly would have been rather the more conſiſtent Scheme of the two, and ſomewhat a more defenſible Explication of your Notion, (with reſpect to the *bare Reaſon* of the Thing,) than to affirm that all Souls are *naturally mortal*, and yet that none of them ever die by a *natural decay and Mortality.* But your Hypotheſis, however varied, would not yet have been truly conſiſtent. For why, I beſeech you, muſt it needs be ſuppoſed, that God

cannot

cannot diſpoſe of all his rational Creatures into States ſuitable to their ſeveral Natures, and proportionable to their ſeveral capacities and deſerts, without deſtroying and taking away their Being? And what can be more forced and diſagreeable to Reaſon, than to ſuppoſe that the Sodomites and Ninevites and other Heathens of all Sorts, muſt indeed all appear at the Day of Judgment, but yet that their appearance there will be * *with no deſign of concerning them in the Judgment of the Day, but only in the retroſpective part of the day, for vindicating the Divine Providence, in relation to what had been tranſacted by it formerly?* You imagine indeed, † that *the Sodomites and Egyptians* and other wicked Men to whom the Goſpel was never preached, *may endure the Sufferings of the future eternal State, during the time of their Duration; that is, from the time of their Death to the day of Judgment*; And that * *the Infelicities good Heathens may have ſuffered in this Life, may be ſufficiently rewarded by the Happineſs of the intermediate ſpace between their Death and the Judgment, though they have no ſhare in thoſe Eternal Rewards which*

* pag. 148.

† pag. 159.

* pag. 311.

which are to follow after the day of Judgment: But, upon your Scheme, how can this be applied to thoſe who ſhall live at the End of the World, when there may be as good and as bad Men among the Heathens, as ever were in any other Age, and yet theſe, according to your notion, muſt All periſh together at the Conflagration? And beſides, becauſe I preſume you will not be leſs moved by Authority than by Reaſon; is not This extremely like one of thoſe very Notions, which *Tertullian*, whoſe Authority you are otherwiſe ſo very deſirous to make uſe of, blames the * *Stoicks* for, and ridicules them as vainly and * needleſly imagining, that the Souls of their Diſciples ſhould continue capable of Inſtruction and Improvement in the ſeparate State, when at the ſame time they believed they were all to periſh in the approaching *Conflagration*?

* Qui animæ aliquod tempus indulgent, ab exceſſu uſq; in *conflagrationem* univerſitatis, ut Stoici, &c. *Tertull. de Anima.*

Τῶν ψυχὴν χρονικὸν ἐπὶ τῇ φθαρτῷ. οὐκ ἐνδὺς ἡ σώματος ἀπαγαγεῖσα φθορεὺς· ἀλλ' ὁπωσιοῦν πρὸς χρόνους καθ' ἑαυτὸν· ἐπὶ μὴ τὴν ἀπαθανάτων, μέχρι τῆς εἰς πῦρ ἀναλύσεως τῶν πάντων· &c. *Numenius apud Euſeb.*

* Quis autem illis poſtumæ Cruditionis uſus ac fructus, jamjam *conflagrationi* perituris? *Tertull. de Anima.*

What

What you advance in your 41*ſt and following Sections*, concerning the State and Condition of *ſeparate Souls*, is in every reſpect too uncertain to have any thing built upon it. Whether they who never heard of the Goſpel in This Life, ſhall hereafter have any new Offer made to them, and undergo any new Trial; or whether all Mankind, even thoſe who never hear of Chriſt at all, ſhall however, by virtue of the original Promiſe of the Meſſiah made to *Adam*, have ſo much benefit of the redemption purchaſed by the Blood of Chriſt, as that at the general Judgment they ſhall all in ſome Proportions, and according to their ſeveral Capacities, have relief from the Equity and Mercy of the Goſpel-covenant; (Which, ſeems, of the two, to be much the more probable Opinion: For how ſhall they who are found alive at the end of the World, undergo any new Trial?) Which-ſoever, I ſay, of theſe ways be true, it makes little difference as to the main Queſtion. That, upon the whole, God is no reſpecter of Perſons;

and

and that our Saviour *could not confine his deſign, as a Saviour of Souls*, to any particular people, (as you prove largely and well in your 47th Section,) but will certainly in ſome manner or other extend the Offer of his gracious Covenant, or at leaſt the Benefit and Equity of it in ſome Proportions, to Men of all Ages and Nations in the World; muſt undoubtedly be allowed by all conſidering Perſons: And this very conſideration alone, if you had not at other times reaſoned inconſiſtently with your ſelf, might eaſily have ſaved you the whole trouble of inventing your wonderful Hypotheſis concerning the natural Mortality of the Soul, in order to diſpoſe of thoſe Gentiles who never heard of Chriſt: But then as to the particular Manner, how the Equity and Mercy of the Goſpel ſhall be extended to thoſe to whom it never was preached; this, there is no Neceſſity of determining; And certainly your Notion, (*Sect.* 42,) concerning ſeparate Souls being of neceſſity to be *baptized with Water*, even in the *Literal Senſe*, in order to be made capable of any

Favour

Favour of this kind; might very well have been ſpared.

As to what you teach in the 48*th and following Sections*, concerning *two diſtinct Souls* in Men; Many antient Writers do indeed ſo expreſs themſelves, as if they ſuppoſed the *ſenſitive Soul* to be one Subſtance and the *rational Soul* another: But both That Philoſophy it ſelf, and your explication of it particularly, is very unintelligible: And your Interpretation of that Text, where the Formation of Man is deſcribed, is really ridiculous; The Words are theſe; *And the Lord God formed Man of the Duſt of the Ground, and breathed into his Noſtrils the Breath of Life, and Man became a living Soul*, Gen. 2, 7. Upon this Text, you † ſay; *Here is a Man ſuppoſed before the Divine Breathing; Certainly not a dead Man, which is indeed no Man, but a Man animated with that lower Soul, which is common to him and Beaſts, and therefore cannot be imputed to a Divine Breathing.* Can any thing be more abſurd than this Interpretation? or can any thing be more plain,

† *pag.* 216.

plain, than that the meaning of these Words is, that God first formed the *Body* of Man out of the Dust, and then inspired into it a living *Soul*? But which way soever the Philosophy of this Question be determined, it will still be nothing to your purpose: For suppose, if you please, that the *Sensitive* and *Rational* Soul be really two distinct Substances; yet how does this tend to prove that the *Rational Soul* is ever the more *naturally Mortal*? Did not those antient Philosophers, who thought Man composed of three distinct parts, a *Body*, a *sensitive Soul*, and a *rational Spirit*; teach that the *rational Spirit* was *naturally Immortal*? as you your self confess † concerning *Plato* and *Philo*; and you bring no Authority nor Reasoning, in these Sections, to the contrary.

† *pag.* 22. & 23.

In like manner your long Excursion, in the 55*th Section*, concerning the *Separate State*, does not at all prove, nor indeed so much as suppose, that the Soul is *naturally Mortal*: On the contrary, the Authorities you there cite, do all suppose it *Immortal*. Wherefore the particular groundless,

not to ſay abſurd Notions, which you there advance, concerning the *Habitations of ſeparate Souls*, and the *Extent of the Power of Evil Spirits over them*, &c; not being of any Importance with reſpect to the main Queſtion; need not here be examined.

The Argument you propoſe, (*Sect.* 60,) that *a naturally mortal Soul is more ſuitable and agreeable to be joyned with a naturally mortal Body, as a conſtituent of Human Nature, than a Soul that is naturally Immortal.* This Argument, if it proved any thing, would prove that the Soul ought to be of the ſame Nature and Duration with the Body, and that it ought to die at the ſame time with the Body, that is, that there ought to be no Soul at all. For it is juſt as much diſagreeable and unſuitable to the Body, to have ſuch a Subſtance united to it, as is capable of ſubſiſting at all after the Diſſolution of the Body; as to have ſuch a Subſtance united to it, as is capable of continuing to ſubſiſt for ever. Since therefore you your ſelf acknowledge that

that the Soul is naturally able to ſubſiſt ſeparate for many Ages after the diſſolution of the Body; this Argument, if it had any ſtrength in it, would prove a great deal too much for you; and be of the ſame force againſt *your own* Notion of the Soul, as againſt *ours*; Unleſs you could perſwade the World to believe, that not only the *Immortalizing Spirit*, but even the *rational Soul*, that Soul which you ſuppoſe to be *naturally Mortal*, is itſelf alſo a *præternatural Principle*, (as you * once or twice very abſurdly aſſert,) and not originally a conſtituent Part of Human Nature.

* *Præmon. pag.* 24. and *Diſcourſ. p.* 300.

Neither has the Argument you draw from the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, any greater ſtrength in it. For there is no neceſſity of ſuppoſing, upon any Scheme, that ſuch Perſons as have no actual Sin of their own, ſhall ever be condemned to eternal Torments merely for the Sin of our firſt Parent. 'Tis true we cannot peremptorily affirm in particular, how God will diſpoſe of ſuch Souls, as having no actual Sins of

their own to anſwer for, yet have no expreſs Title, by the ordinary Means, to the Rewards of the Goſpel: But certainly 'tis a very weak and poor Argument, to conclude that numberleſs Souls muſt therefore neceſſarily be annihilated, merely becauſe we do not know in particular, what State and Condition it will pleaſe God to aſſign them.

The ſame may be ſaid of your Argument drawn from the Doctrine of *Reprobation*. You anſwer it your ſelf, by ſuppoſing that the Doctrine of *abſolute Reprobation* is not the Doctrine of Scripture. And as to that *Præteritiion*, which is barely the not affording all Men the ſame Means of Knowledge; 'tis anſwered in your own Scheme, by what you ſay (*Sect.* 45, 46, and 47) concerning the new Trial ſome Perſons may undergo in another State; and 'tis anſwered better, by ſuppoſing that all Men may however be judged in proportion, according to the Equity of the Goſpel, though they never had any explicit Knowledge of it.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, As to your Argument drawn from the Difficulty of reconciling eternal Puniſhments with the Goodneſs of God; That Difficulty does not ariſe chiefly from the *difference of the Perſons*, who may be concerned in thoſe Puniſhments proportionably in *different degrees*; but the real difficulty of the Queſtion lies in this, how it is reconcileable with the Goodneſs of God, to put *any Perſons at all* upon a neceſſity of making ſuch an *Option*, wherein if they chooſe amiſs, the Miſery they incurr muſt be irrecoverable. And this difficulty is evidently much better anſwered, by ſuppoſing the Souls of Men to be naturally immortal; ſo that they who render themſelves uncapable of Happineſs, muſt conſequently fall into remedileſs Miſery; than it can be anſwered in *your* Scheme, where none can be liable to endleſs Puniſhment, without being miraculouſly immortalized on purpoſe, by the Arbitrary Will and Power of God, beyond the original Capacity of their Nature.

And

And now, Sir, I cannot but earneſtly recommend it again to your moſt ſerious conſideration; whether the new and inconſiderate Notions you have advanced, and (the Arguments I will not ſay, becauſe I think you have not offered any that are of any real force, but) the Pretenſes of Reaſon and Authority, which you have put into the Hands of ſceptical and profane Men, to confirm them in their prejudices againſt the Belief of the Immortality of the Soul; are not likely to be of great diſſervice to Religion; And whether you ought not (as all good Men are of Opinion you ought) to think of ſome means of making ſatisfaction to the Church, to whom you have given ſo great Offence; and of preventing the effect of that incouragement, which your Notions in this matter (tho' no Body doubts but it is contrary to your intention) have given to Immorality and contempt of Religion.

If zeal for the defenſe of a Doctrine of ſuch importance, has in any part of this Letter cauſed me to drop any Expreſſions, which may be thought too

too ſharp, and to carry in them too little of that reſpect, which all the World acknowledges to be juſtly due to you upon account of your very great Learning; I know you will pardon it upon ſuch an occaſion as this; and I cannot doubt but upon ſecond Thoughts, you will be ſomewhat diſſatisfied with *your ſelf*, for having publiſhed a Book, at which all good Men are ſorry, and all profane Men rejoyce.

FINIS.

A D-

ADVERTISEMENT.

WHereas the Author of certain Remarks upon the Sermons preached at Mr *Boyles* Lecture in the Year 1704, has publiſhed a Vindication of thoſe Remarks, with more miſrepreſentation of the Doctrine contained in thoſe Sermons, and in thoſe preached in the Year 1705: The Author of the ſaid Sermons, humbly conceiving that there is no Objection either in the Remarks or in the Vindication of the Remarks, which has not been either prevented in the Sermons themſelves, or fully anſwered in the Preface to the ſecond Volume; and not thinking it fit to trouble the World with any further Reply to mere Calumny and ill language; deſires to refer this matter wholly to the impartial Reader, who by comparing the Books themſelves, with the Remarks, will judge on which ſide Truth and Reaſon ſtands.

BOOKS

BOOKS Printed for James Knapton, *at the* Crown *in St.* Paul's *Church-Yard*

A Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God: More particularly in Anſwer to Mr. *Hobbs*, *Spinoza*, and their Followers. Wherein the Notion of *Liberty* is ſtated, and the Poſſibility and Certainty of it proved, in Oppoſition to *Neceſſity* and *Fate*. Being the Subſtance of Eight Sermons Preach'd at the Cathedral-Church of St *Paul*, in the Year 1704. at the Lecture Founded by the Honourable *Robert Boyle* Eſq; Price 3 *s.* 6 *d.*

A Diſcourſe concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the *Chriſtian Revelation*. Being Eight Sermons Preach'd at the Cathedral Church of St *Paul*, in the Year 1705, at the Lecture Founded by the Honourable *Robert Boyle* Eſq; By *Samuel Clark*, M. A. Chaplain to the Right Reverend Father in God *John* Lord Biſhop of *Norwich*.

A Paraphraſe on the Four *Evangeliſts*. Wherein, for the clearer Underſtanding the Sacred Hiſtory, the whole Text and Paraphraſe are Printed in ſeparate Columns over-againſt each other. Together with Critical Notes on the more difficult Paſſages, very Uſeful for Families. In two Volumes. By *Samuel Clarke*, M. A. Chaplain to the Right Reverend Father in God, *John*, Lord Biſhop of *Norwich*. Price 12 *s.*

The whole Duty of a Chriſtian, Plainly Repreſented in three Practical Eſſays, on *Baptiſm*, *Confirmation* and *Repentance* Containing full Inſtructions for a Holy Life: With earneſt Exhortations, eſpecially to young Perſons, drawn from the Conſideration of the Severity of the Diſcipline of the Primitive Church. The 2d. Edition. By *Samuel Clarke*, M. A. Chaplain to the Right Reverend Father in God *John* Lord Biſhop of *Norwich*. Price ſtitch'd 6 *d.* Bound 12 *d* Fine Paper.

Jacobi Rohaulti Phyſica. Latine, vertit, recenſuit, & uberioribus jam Annotationibus ex illuſtriſſimi *Iſaaci Neutoni* Philoſophia maximam partem hauſtis, amplificavit & ornavit *Samuel Clarke*, M. A. Admodum Reverendo in Chriſto patri, Joanni Epiſcopo Norvicenſi, a Sacris Domeſticis. Accedunt etiam in hac ſecunda Editione, novæ aliquot Tabulæ æri incæiſ. 8*vo*. Price 8 *s.*

Some Reflections on that part of a Book called *Amyntor*, Or, The Defence of *Milton*'s Life, which relates to the Writings of the Primitive Fathers and the Canon of the New Teſtament. *In a Letter to a Friend*. Octavo. Price 6 *d.*

Several

Books Printed for J. Knapton.

Several Diſconrſes, eoncerning the Shortneſs of Humane Charity. The Perfection of the Mercy of God. The difference of Times with reſpect to Religion. The Joy which the Righteous have in God. The ſecret Blaſting of Men. The Inſtructtive Diſcipline of God. The Danger of Unfaithfulneſs to God. The Malignity of Popery, The Deccitfulneſs of Sin. The Converſion of a Sinner. Alſo, the Prayer uſed before Sermon. Vol. I. The 2d Edit.

Several Diſcourſes, concerning the true Valuation of Man. The Neceſſary Repentance of a Sinner. The Exerciſe and Progreſs of a Chriſtian. The Frailty of Humane Nature. The Juſtice of one towards another. The Nature of Salvation by Chriſt, *&c.* Being Twenty Sermons, Vol. II. Price 5*s.*

Several Diſcourſes, concerning the Moral part of Religion Reinforced by Chriſtianity. The Reconciliation of Sinners by the Death of Chriſt. The Mediation of Chriſt, the Grand Inſtitutiou of God. The Arguments by which Men ſhould be perſwaded to Reconcile unto God. The Eſſence of Religion, a Diſpoſition for God. The Decency of Life recommended by Religion. The glorious Evidence and Power of Divine Truth. The Venerable Nature, and Tranſcendant Benefit of the Chriſtian Religion. The Abſolute Neceſſity of Religious Obedience, and unavoidable Perdition of the Diſobedient. The Illuſtrious Manifeſtations of God, and the Inexcuſable ignorance of Men. The Unnataral Ingratitude of the Profane and Irreligious. The Miſerable Degeneracy of Men through their Affectation of Atheiſm, and practiſe of Wickedneſs. The Direful Vengeance which falls upon the Souls of Incorrigible Sinners. But thoſe who are truly Religious, will be delivered from all dangerous Errours about Religion. That the Unity of the Church is carefully maintained by all thoſe who are ſincere Chriſtians. All Three by the Reverend and Learned *Benjamin Whitchcote*, D. D. Sometime Miniſter of St. *Lawrence Jury*, *London*. Examined and Corrected by his own Notes; and Publiſhed by *John Jeffery*, D. D. Arch-Deacon of *Norwich*. price 5*s.*

Confeſſio, ſive Declaratio, Sententiæ Paſtorum, qui in Fæderato Belgio Remonſtrantes vocantur, ſuper præcipuis Articulis Religionis Chriſtianæ. 12*s.* Price 1*s.* 6. *d.*

Devotions, *viz.* Confeſſions, Petitions, Interceſſions, and Thanſgivings for every day of the Week; and alſo Before, At, and After the Sacrament: With Occaſional Prayers for all Perſons whatſoever. By *Thomas Bennet*, M. A. Rector of St. *James*'s in *Colcheſter*, and Fellow of St. *John*'s College in *Cambridge*. *pr.* 1*s.*6*d.*

Dictionarium Sacrum ſeu Religioſum. A Dictionary of all Religions, *Ancient and Modern*, whether *Jewiſh*, *Pagan*, *Chriſtian* or *Mahometan.*

Mahometan. More Particulatly Comprehending, I. The Lives and Doctrines of the Authors and Propagators. II. The Reſpective Diviſions, Sects and Hereſies. III. Not only the True, but Falſe Objects of Worſhip, ſuch as Heathen Gods, Idols, *&c.* IV. The various Ways and Places of Adoration. V. All Religious Orders and Communities. VI Sacred Rites, Utenſils and Feſtivals. VII. Diſtinct Offices and Functions. VIII. Rules, Cuſtoms, Ceremonies, *&c.* Price 4 *s.* 6 *d.*

A New and Accurate Deſcription of the Coaſt of *Guinea*, divided into the Gold, the Slave, and the Ivory Coaſts Containing a Geographical, Political and Natural Hiſtory of the Kingdoms and Countries: With a Particular Account of the Riſe, Progreſs and Preſent Condition of all the *European* Settlements upon that Coaſt; and the Juſt Meaſures for improving the ſeveral Branches of the *Guinea* Trade. Illuſtrated with ſeveral CUTTS. Written Originally in *Dutch* by *William Boſman*, Chief Factor for the *Dutch* at the Caſtle of St *George d' Elmina.* And now faithfully done into *Engliſh.* To which is perfix'd, an exact Map of the whole Coaſt of *Guinea*, that was not in the Original.

An Account of the Formation of Foſſil-ſhells, *&c.* Wherein is propoſed a way to Reconcile the two different Opinions, of thoſe who affirm them to be the *Exuviæ of real Animals*, and thoſe who fancy them to be *Luſus Naturæ.*

An Introduction to the Hiſtory of the *Kingdoms* and *States* of *Aſia*, *Africa* and *America*, both Ancient and Modern, according to the Method of *Samuel Puffendorf*, Counſeller of State to the Late King of *Sweden.*

The *Accompliſh'd Female Inſtructer:* Or a very uſeful Companion for Ladies Gentlewomen, and others. In Two Parts. *Part.* I. Treating of generous Breeding and Behaviour; Choice of Company, Friendſhip; the Art of Speaking well, Directions in Love, Carriage in Company, Converſation, Affability, Courteſy and Humility; the Myſtery of Eloquence. Of ſuitable Recreations, Modeſty, Chaſtity, Religion, Charity, Compaſſion, Contentinent of Mind, Devotion and Prayer. *Part* II. Treating of making curious Confectionaries, or Sweet-Meats, Jellies, Syrups, Cordial-waters, Brandies, Wines of *Engliſh* Fruit, and other uſeful Liquors; to imitate Foreign Wines; to know good Proviſions, Whiten Ivory, Cement Glaſs, China or Metal; to Paint, Japan, make Wax-works, Rock-work, or Works in Gold, Silk, Silver, *&c.* the Art of Perfuming and Preſerving Cloaths from Vermin or Inſects: with Directions for the preſervation of Health; and a great Number of other uſeful and profitable things.

Pious

Books Printed for J. Knapton

Pious Breathings; being the Meditations of St. *Auguſtine*; his Treatiſe of the Love, of God, Soliloquies, and Manuals: To which are added, ſelect Contemplations from St. *Anſelm*, and St *Bernard*. Made Engliſh by *George Stanhope* D. D. Dean of *Canterbury*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to her Majeſty. The ſecond Edition. Price. 5 *d*.

An Inſtitution of Fluxions, containing the firſt Princip'es, the *Operations*, with ſome of the Uſes and Applications of that *Admirable Method*; According to the Scheme prefix'd to his Tract of *Quadratures*, by (its Firſt Inventor) the Incomparable Sir *Iſaac Newton*. By *Humphry Ditton*. Price 5 *s*.

Dr *Davenant* on the Revenue 2 parts, 8*vo*.
——Ballance of Trade, 8*vo*.
——on Grants and Reſumptions, ——8*vo*.
——on Ballance of Power, 8*vo*.
——on War abroad and Peace at home, 8*vo*.
Capt. *Dampier*'s Voyages Round the World, 1ſt Pt. 5th Ed.
——2d. Vol. 3d. Edit.
——3d. Vol.
Wafer's Voyages, 2d. Edit.
The God-father's Advice to his Son, 12*o*.
Government of the Paſſion, 12*o*.
Dr *Sydenham*'s Proceſſus, 12*o*.
Malbranch of Morality, 8*vo*.
A New Method of curing Fevors, 12*o*.
Barns's Anacreon, 12*o*.
Woolſtons old Apology.
A Diſcourſe upon uniting *Scotland* with *England*.
Dr *Scots* Chriſt. Life, 5 Vol. 8*vo*.
Ellis de Articuli.
Plutarchs Lives, 5 Vol.
Littletons Dictionary, 4*to*.
Mr. *Wingate*'s Arithmetick, the 11th Edit.
Hiſtory of the Inquiſition of *Goa*.
Artificial Clock-maker, 12*o*.
Arcana Imperii Detecta, 8*vo*.
Boyer's Dictonary in 4*o*.
——Idem 8*vo*.
View of the Poſture of Affairs in *Europe*.
Surgeon's Aſſiſtant, 8*vo*.
Life of King *James*, 8*vo*.
——of King *William*, 8*vo*.
De Chales Euclid, *Eng*. 8*vo*.
Bennet of Schiſm, 8*vo*.
—— Confutation of Popery, 8*vo*.
——of Quakeriſm, 8*vo*.
Stanhope's St *Auſt. Meditation*, 8*vo*.
L' Eſtranges Æſop, Fol.
Horace Delph. 8*vo*.
Schrevelius Lexicon, 8*vo*.
Seneca's Morals, 8*vo*.
Hookers Politie, Fol.
Tillotſons Works, Fol.
——in 8*vo*, 14 Vol.
Patricks Commentary, 9 Vol. 4*to*.
Gradus ad Parnaſſum, in 12*o*.

RECOVERED
1935.